

THE TRADITION OF
THE CRITICS

THE TRADITION OF THE CRITICS

BY
DAROLD BOLLOWAY, M.A.
LONDON

The University of Chicago
Library



Gift of the Author



E R R A T A.

Page 25, line 24 - Instead of "spake"
read "speak I."

Page 25 - Transpose lines 40 and 41.

Page 58 - Between lines 6 and 7 insert
"-selves as to the extent of the diffi-
culty and, when we have done so, we
shall."

Page 81, line 27 - Instead of "Selbie"
read "Garvie."

Page 85- Delete line 8 and substitute -
"In the case of George the Sinner it is
probable that his knowledge."

Page 85, line 26 - The third word in
this line should read "Principal."

THE TWILIGHT OF THE CRITICS

Being Studies and Reflections on the
Fourth Gospel

by

HAROLD HOLLOWAY, M. A., Lond.,

with a Foreword by

the Rt. Rev. BISHOP WALTER J. CAREY, D. D.,
sometime Bishop of Bloemfontein.

BS3615
.H76



Gift of author

To

MY BELOVED WIFE

in grateful recognition of more than thirty years of happy married life
and to

the dear memory of our eldest son,

PILOT-OFFICER IAN ALLISON MERVYN HOLLOWAY
R. A. F. V. R.

formerly of Cherry Orchard Preparatory School, Blackheath
and Eastbourne College,

Missing, presumed Killed in Action,
20th April, 1943,

this Book is
respectfully dedicated.

FOREWORD

Is it an exaggeration to say that St. John's Gospel is the most important and deepest book in the world? My conviction is that it is no exaggeration, but to appreciate the book you must have got on a bit, you must be a thinker, you must have some spiritual or mystical spark in you. Yet St. John's Gospel is no book in the clouds. It deals with facts, though primarily with the true interpretation of the facts. One thing is certain. Until you realize that Jesus Christ is God's Word spoken to creation; until you believe that He is 'God of God' and 'Light of Light,' Who, though truly Man, is also truly God, you will never see light; for He said things, and He gave judgments, that only God could rightly say and give. His terrific judgments and His scarifying condemnations of evil could have been given by no mere sinful human. No mere man could speak thus. Either He is God Incarnate or He is not good, is not humble, and is indeed a megalomaniac; but, if He is what St. John says, and I, for one, utterly believe, if He is the expression and revelation of God Himself, then all falls into place. He was right to condemn evil, though we are always trying to palliate and smooth it down. Evil is evil and is altogether diabolical and ruinous, and we mere mortals hesitate because we have touched it ourselves. He hadn't, and therefore He could speak; and we (as we grow into Him and partake of the Divine Nature) shall also so speak one day, when goodness is all in all and evil vile and irredeemable. This is the core and centre of all. God has become man that men may become God. This will be misinterpreted only by fools, for though we, for ever, shall still be sinners redeemed, yet we shall also by the miracle and mystery of God's Grace be so one-d with Christ that we are wrapped—in Him—into the essential Life of the Blessed Trinity. Miss this, and you miss all. For those who believe that we wretched sinners can be thus 'deified' and find our supreme end and joy in God, St. John's Gospel is everything. How many come to it in the end! How many write about it—Westcott, Scott Holland, Armitage-Robinson, William Temple and so very many saints and scholars! Here is one more expositor, not with a great name, but with a burning love and zeal and a faith that he too has seen something worth passing on. God bless him and his readers and us all.

WALTER CAREY, Bishop.

INTRODUCTION

This work is a result of the author's perusal, more than twenty years ago, of the chapter on 'The Spiritual Gospel' in B. W. Bacon's 'Making of the New Testament.' The author was considerably disturbed by Bacon's conclusions and determined by wider reading both in and about the Fourth Gospel to satisfy himself as to their correctness or otherwise. In the course of his studies he has received much help and encouragement from members of his family and from friends outside the family circle, among whom he would specially mention Mr. W. H. B. Mears, although Mr. Mears, whose religious standpoint is very different from the author's, is not of course to be held in any way responsible for anything in the book. The Reading Room of the British Museum, the London Library and Dr. Williams' Library have all been utilized and, while the volume of literature on the Fourth Gospel is far too extensive to permit of an exhaustive study, the author has read as widely in English, French and German as his time and circumstances permitted. He has found the Commentary of Lagrange especially useful and has come to the conclusion that the most significant recent contributions available in English to the elucidation of the Fourth Gospel are those of Burch, Odeberg and Gardner-Smith. He desires to record his warm thanks to Bishop Walter J. Carey for having so kindly consented to write a Foreword to the present volume.

Blackheath, November, 1950.

The Twilight of the Critics

CHAPTER I

PROLEGOMENA.

About the end of the First Century A. D. there appeared a very remarkable Book—the Book known to us to-day as the Gospel according to John or the Fourth Gospel. Save by inference we have no knowledge of the circumstances of its composition or of its publication. The balance of opinion names Ephesus as the place where it first saw the light, but even here dissentient voices are raised, and the Book itself does not name its author. For some sixteen centuries (approximately 200—1800 A. D.) he was almost universally held to have been the Apostle John, but during the last century-and-a-half there has been persistent discussion as to the accuracy of this opinion, and the extant passage from an almost contemporary author *(1) which some (2) have thought one of the most valuable pieces of external evidence bearing on the question is deprived of much of its weight by a doubt as to the correct translation of the Greek in which it is written. Whoever the author of the Gospel was, scholars still argue as to whether he intended to write History or Allegory. Yet this Book has had a profound influence in helping to determine the main tenets of the Christian religion throughout the centuries. Origen (185-254 A. D.) wrote of it as “the first fruits of the Gospel”; writers of our own day have described it as ‘the most beautiful book in the world’ (3) and the book regarded by most Christian believers as ‘the very summit of biblical revelation’ (4) while an Archbishop of the Church of England lately declared that he had more love for it than for any other book (5).

It is not surprising that a voluminous literature, both critical and devotional, has grown up around the Gospel, and in theory he who would write to-day upon it ought to preface his work by a complete survey of that literature. In practice one is forced by the shortness of human life to be content with much less, and in this connection there are two important considerations to be borne in mind. In such a literature there is necessarily a large amount of overlap and repetition, and it is generally possible to obtain a sufficient idea of the views of any school of thought by the intensive study of a single representative writer or a few representative writers belonging to that school. Far more important is the fact that the most valuable source of information about the Fourth Gospel is the Fourth Gospel itself, and insufficient attention to this consideration has deprived some scholarly work of much of its value.

*Inserted numbers refer to notes at the end of chapter.

the findings of the Biblical Commission have been written to order or without genuine scholarly conviction." In this connection the argument of Lagrange must be accepted when he points out that a scholar feeling genuine doubt as to any of the findings of the Commission is under no obligation to write on the Fourth Gospel or indeed to write at all. The fact that a conclusion is prescribed to a writer in no way implies a lack of honesty in his arguments, and we must not forget the sphere within which the Roman Catholic Church permits its members liberty to form their own judgment. This is illustrated by Lagrange, who writes "Belief in inspiration governs Catholic exegesis, but it does not oblige one to say that the facts have been arranged in chronological order." A most interesting and refreshing study by F. R. Hoare on the "Original Order and Chapters of St. John's Gospel" furnishes a recent example of the exercise of this liberty by a Roman Catholic writer. Nevertheless, within the field covered by the findings of the Biblical Commission it is to the evidence adduced by Roman Catholic writers rather than to their conclusions that Protestants will pay more attention.

Thirdly, there is the Critical, which claims to approach the Bible purely as a work of literature without presuppositions, but too often proceeds on the basis of unproved suppositions contrary to the belief of the great body of Christians, as for example that miracles do not happen or that Jesus could not foresee the future. What a field for argument is opened up by the so-called Higher Criticism! Professor Dodd, who thinks that "we are bound to confess that, where we have gone beyond the great critics of the last century, it is by standing on their shoulders" (8), admits that the term "Higher Criticism" is "singularly infelicitous." (9) The word "Higher" certainly does seem to imply that the Bible is surveyed from a standpoint above itself and, whether "Criticism" means fault-finding or not, much of the so-called Higher Criticism does resolve itself into fault-finding. One has only to read such a book as Schmiedel's "Johannine Writings" to satisfy oneself of that. Professor Dodd may view the work of the critics as providing the foundations upon which our modern knowledge of the Bible is built (10), but this is misplaced generosity. One has to read only a little way into the works of the radical critics at any rate to perceive how exceedingly inconsistent a cultured mind can be, or perhaps we should write "kultured" for the spiritual home of the radical critics was Germany. The real work of this school was not to provide the foundations upon which modern biblical study could be built up, but to shake the religious faith of Protestant Germany and thus to contribute to the creation of the conditions that made the blood bath of two world wars possible.

Even if we could ignore for a moment this essential consideration, what sort of foundation could the critics be said to have provided for biblical study? Scott can write, "I have ventured to assume the results of the critical investigation" and Strachan, "Scholars are gradually enabling us to rethink the writers' thoughts and to real-

ize their intentions; nowhere is our debt greater to New Testament scholarship in this regard than in the case of the Fourth Gospel." On the other hand MacGregor writes, "No book in the New Testament has provoked conclusions more diverse than the Fourth Gospel . . . The verdict of scholarship is still held in suspense," and Professor Dodd can lend the weight of his knowledge to the statement (11) that "if the solution of the Synoptic problem was the most conspicuous success of nineteenth-century criticism, the Fourth Gospel represents its worst failure. The long critical discussion ended in little better than a deadlock." If we are to be expected to follow Scott in an act of homage to "the results of the critical investigation," we are surely entitled to enquire what those results are, for in no other field than the criticism of the Fourth Gospel is the tag "*quot homines tot sententiae*" more thoroughly illustrated, and the conclusions of one scholar are demolished by another with such frequency that the critical investigation might almost be said to have produced no results.

Critics are divided among many schools, and what is said of one cannot be applied to all. A painful impression is however produced when one finds in the works of critics statements such as that the author of the Fourth Gospel "improved" on the spoken words of Jesus (12), that Jesus "dare" not be in Judaea (13), and that between Josephus and the Evangelists our choice should be made in favour of Josephus, if it were shown that they are really irreconcilable (14), or when an Archbishop tells us that "there is no good reason for doubting" a particular passage of Scripture. (15) Critics seem moreover often to have a very poor opinion of their fellows of another school of thought. Thus Bacon can accuse conservatives of "playing fast and loose with evidence," while Lord Charnwood expresses the opinion of many when he charges the radical critics with "abnormal suspiciousness towards evidence which satisfies ordinary people, coupled with abnormal credulity towards evidence which is trifling or null." This latter verdict may well seem justified when one comes to consider the case for the alleged early martyrdom of John, son of Zebedee.

The question of impartiality merits serious attention. Garvie urges, with regard to Westcott and Scott, that "each is weak in that he does not give heed to what in the Gospel gives strength to the position of the other." He might have said the same with regard to McClymont and Forbes. There is a sense in which the believer in Jesus cannot be impartial, as the term is commonly understood. For him an attitude of cold neutrality with regard to his Lord is impossible. He may or may not, for example, see with Schmiedel in John V, 43, an allusion to the rebellion of Bar Cochba in 132-135 A. D., but, if he does, he will not on that account assume with Schmiedel that the Fourth Gospel (or at least this portion of it) must have been written after 132 A. D.

A certain amount of apparent one-sidedness in the discussion of

crucial questions is not a defect. If the Fourth Gospel was the work of the Apostle John, all the relevant facts, properly interpreted, must be consistent with a conclusion to that effect, and this is true individually of each and every one of them. Conversely, if the Gospel was not the work of the Apostle, any relevant fact which appears to indicate that it was requires to be reinterpreted. When therefore a writer has made up his mind in the light of the evidence, it is his duty, so far as he is able, to point to interpretations of the facts that exhibit them as parts of the consistent whole he knows they must be. Merely to arrange and display apparently inconsistent facts may seem to point to impartiality, but is quite as likely to be a sign of intellectual indolence.

When on the other hand we come to the historicity of the narrative, it is plain that similar considerations do not apply. Each event that is recorded requires separate examination, and the conclusion arrived at with regard to one fact or set of facts is not necessarily applicable to another. At the same time one may arrive at a conclusion with regard to the general credibility of an author on the basis of an examination of the evidence relating to some only of the facts he records, and belief in that general credibility will gain strength with every increase in the number of facts separately examined and regarded as established. A conclusion with regard to general credibility may in its turn be sufficient to tilt the balance in the case of a fact in regard to which the evidence is more ambiguous.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I:

- (1) Papias.
- (2) E. g., Mommsen.
- (3) V. Burch.
- (4) W. F. Howard.
- (5) Archbishop Temple.
- (6) Hugh Pope, *The Catholic Student's Aids to the Bible*, Vol. IV. (1926). pages 816-7.
- (7) *Idem*, page 264.
- (8) *The Bible Today*, page 27.
- (9) *Idem*, page 24.
- (10) *Idem*, page 25.
- (11) In "The Listener" for 19th December, 1946.
- (12) Wright.
- (13) Scott Holland.
- (14) Goguel.
- (15) Archbishop Bernard.

CHAPTER II.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL & THE SYNOPTICS. THE RAISING OF LAZARUS. THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE.

The discussion of the historicity of the Fourth Gospel generally starts with a comparison between that Gospel and the Synoptics, a comparison which reveals so many differences as to force upon the reader the question which of the two is to be preferred. To this question almost every variety of answer has been given. Schleiermacher (died 1834 A. D.) ranked the Fourth Gospel high above the Synoptics and in consequence is denied by Schmiedel the possession of the historical sense. On the other hand Baur laid down the principle that, wherever the Fourth Gospel conflicts with the Synoptics, the latter are to be preferred. With Baur agreed Wendt, who held that we must test the Johannine record by the Synoptic standard. By the time the first two decades of the present century were reached this view had attained decisive supremacy. The curious thing was that, after the Synoptics had been used to discredit the Fourth Gospel, they were themselves cast aside. In the words of Schmiedel the trustworthiness of the first three Gospels "is subject to considerable limitations." So what we were asked to accept was that the Johannine representation must be discarded because it does not coincide with the Synoptic, although the Synoptic representation is not to be regarded as itself in accordance with the facts. This kind of argument, which ought to have required no more than statement to ensure its rejection, is unfortunately typical of much that is put forward by the critics. During the last quarter of a century there has been a distinct turning of the tide. This change has been brought about by several causes, among them being the demonstration by Gardner-Smith that the Fourth Gospel does not, as had been believed, exhibit literary dependency on the Synoptics, and the fact, well stated by Garvie, that the completeness of the Synoptic record is an assumption which the results of modern scholarship are more and more disproving. The changed attitude to the Fourth Gospel finds expression in the dicta of Lord Charnwood, who says that "there are a number of points on which John conflicts with Mark, and the balance of probability . . . is in his favour in . . . many of these instances"; of Anderson Scott, who tells us rather grudgingly that "there are **EVEN** matters on which John appears to have preserved a more trustworthy tradition than the Synoptic Gospels"; of Moffatt, who is epitomised by Howard as stating that in a number of ways the superior accuracy of the Johannine information must be allowed; and of A. H. McNeile, whom Howard quotes as authority for the view that on some points the Fourth Evangelist "probably had the more trustworthy information."

We must now proceed to test the correctness or otherwise of these views by a detailed examination of points of apparent conflict

between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. Sadler indeed says that "the Gospels are not divergent but complementary, the Fourth Gospel supplying throughout the answer to most important questions which the Synoptic narratives suggest but do not solve." (1) The matter is not however quite as simple as Sadler has suggested.

In any comparison between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics it should be borne in mind that in the main the latter reproduce a common tradition and consequently, where they differ from the Fourth Gospel, it is really a case of one voice against one and not of three voices against one, as might at first sight appear. Moreover, if the Fourth Gospel is the work of an eye-witness (a question which will have to be considered later), its testimony may often have to be preferred on that account, since none of the Synoptic Gospels is, at any rate in its present form, the work of one who was actually present at the events he records.

According to Wright the crucial differences between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics concern the Raising of Lazarus and Jesus' consciousness of His Messiahship.

A number of causes must have contributed to the catastrophe which terminated Jesus' earthly life and ministry, and among these the frequent breach of the Jewish Sabbath and the Parable of the Vineyard with its far-reaching implications must not be overlooked. From the Synoptic narrative, however, it would appear that the tragedy was precipitated by the Cleansing of the Temple, while in the Fourth Gospel the Raising of Lazarus takes its place as the determining factor. Not only so, but the Raising of Lazarus, to which the Fourth Gospel assigns such decisive importance, is unmentioned by the Synoptics. P. V. Smith indeed sees the possibility of a reference to it in Luke XIX, 37, but the terms of that passage are too general to permit of its use as evidence. What is the reason for the Synoptic omission? Schmiedel, with his usual downrightness, declares that "we cannot discover a single intelligible reason why the Synoptics have not related the Raising of Lazarus" (2) and tells us that "in the Fourth Gospel . . . the decision is caused by an event of which the Synoptics know nothing at all—by the Raising of Lazarus." (3) How Schmiedel could discover that the Synoptists knew nothing at all about the Raising of Lazarus when the only evidence before him was that they did not allude to it in their narratives passes comprehension, and Garvie is more gentle when he writes, "Some reason which we cannot now conjecture there must have been for silence." Howard takes the same line—"The silence of the earlier Gospels has never yet been explained."

Certainty in this matter may indeed well be unattainable on the evidence now available to us, but a probable explanation of the Synoptic silence may not be out of reach. In the first place there is no mention of Peter (usually so prominent among the disciples) in the account given by the Fourth Evangelist of the miracle and the events which immediately preceded and followed it. It may be

therefore that Peter was not actually present on this occasion and consequently did not lay stress on the miracle in his subsequent preaching, which was the main source of Mark's information. Moreover, while to the modern mind the Raising of Lazarus may seem to outstrip in wonder all the other recorded miracles of Jesus, it must not be assumed that it would necessarily have made the same impression on the minds of writers of the First Century A. D. whose available space was strictly limited and who had to select from a vast mass of material. These considerations are important, but they do not completely remove the difficulty. Renan indeed sees in the whole story an elaboration of a saying of Jesus—"I am the Resurrection"—but, as Hoskyns points out, this theory has had little influence on serious criticism, acceptable as one might have expected it to be to the radical critics. Others would seek to account for the Synoptic omission by a desire not to embarrass the family of Lazarus, but by the time the Synoptic Gospels were given to the world this motive would have lost most of its force, if indeed it ever had any. In fact the omission of this particular miracle leaves the development of events in the closing days of Jesus' life on earth largely unaccounted for in the Synoptic narrative. The tumultuous reception accorded to Jesus when He entered Jerusalem is inexplicable unless something happened which the Synoptics do not record. That something is disclosed in the Fourth Gospel. Yet, if the Johannine explanation is the true one, why, we must ask again, the Synoptic silence?

In John XII, 10 we are told that, after the miracle, the chief priests consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death. Here then were the chief priests planning the deaths of two persons, Jesus and Lazarus. We know that in the case of Jesus their fell design was carried out. What would be less strange than that they succeeded also in the case of Lazarus? Nor is this unsupported conjecture. There is, as Archbishop Bernard points out in his Commentary, a remarkable absence of traditions about the life of Lazarus after the miracle (4), and this is what we should expect if that life was not prolonged. How then would the matter present itself to the Synoptists? Jesus, with a mighty spiritual effort, had called a man back to life at a stage at which the putrefaction of his body might be expected already to have commenced. What was the sequel? His enemies seemed promptly to have undone His work. It is true that, even on this assumption, the miracle remained as evidence of Jesus' wonderful powers, but its value as propaganda might well seem to the Synoptists to be diminished by subsequent events, and in the process of selection, so very necessary to a first-century writer, they would leave it out. This is not to make a charge of dishonesty against the Synoptists. For their own particular purposes they had to pick and choose, and who can doubt that, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, they chose wisely for those purposes? Posterity was not however to lose

the story of the Raising of Lazarus, and the Fourth Evangelist, perceiving, as the Synoptists did not, the abiding significance of the miracle, fills up the blank left in the story in their narratives and has recorded it for us.

If the suggestion be adopted that Jesus knew that Lazarus' life was not to be prolonged, some of the difficulties that impress one on reading the eleventh chapter of the Fourth Gospel at once disappear. In verse 6 of that chapter we are told that, "when Jesus had heard that Lazarus was sick, He abode two days still in the place where He was," and at first sight this is hard to reconcile with what we know to have been His readiness to relieve human suffering. It is moreover in sharp contrast with verse 35 of the chapter, where we read that "Jesus wept." Why should He have wept when He was about to recall Lazarus to life? It is sometimes suggested that the cause of His tears was general and not particular to the case of Lazarus, that the thought of the suffering caused to humanity by the apparently premature death of the young overcame His composure for the moment. Is it not more likely that Jesus first tarried and afterwards wept because He knew that, whatever He might do, the moment could not be long deferred when the two devoted sisters must part from their beloved brother? This does not argue any limitation in the power of Jesus. The ways of God are often inscrutable to men, but the divine wisdom overrules all things for good to them that love God. There never was any clash between the will of the Father and the will of the Son. On these grounds it is urged that John XI, 6 and XI, 35 lend further support to the solution of the problem suggested by John XII, 10 and supported by the absence (or comparative absence) of conflicting tradition.

Closely connected with the problem whether it was the Cleansing of the Temple or the Raising of Lazarus that precipitated the catastrophe is the further problem of the correct chronological position of the Cleansing. Does it belong to the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, where the Fourth Gospel places it, or are the Synoptists right in putting it at the end?

It is of course quite possible that Jesus cleansed the Temple twice, as P. V. Smith, for example, thinks, while Burch even suggests that there were three Cleansings. The latter writes—"It was a repeated act on the part of Jesus and not a culminating act of His which drew down the wrath of the Jews . . . He had to repeat Himself . . . The cycle of the festivals . . . would ensure those repetitions."

In support of the view that there were two Cleansings may be cited the apparent divergence of the motive suggested by the language of the Synoptics ("Ye have made it a den of thieves"—Mark XI, 17) from that of the Fourth Gospel ("Make not My Father's House a house of merchandise"—John II, 16). In the former case the objection seems to be to dishonesty in trading, while in the latter it is to the trading itself. Eisler has however suggested that the expression "den of thieves" quoted in the Marcan narrative from

Jeremiah VII, 11 ought rather to be translated "den of slaughterers", and Hoskyns says that "it seems that the Synoptic Gospels do in fact contain evidence that Jesus proclaimed the end of animal sacrifices."

On the assumption that there was only one Cleansing of the Temple, the balance of opinion among scholars is that the Synoptics are right in placing it at the end of the Ministry, and this view is held, not only by those who assign little or no historical value to the Fourth Gospel as a whole, but also by many who place a much higher valuation upon it. In favour of such a conclusion the following arguments are put forward. In the first place such an extraordinary act, based on Messiahship, is thought to be more appropriate to the period of the Triumphal Entry. Secondly, the fact of quotation is held to presuppose a recent utterance. Thirdly, Jesus' allusion to His approaching death is more explicable if the Sanhedrin were already resolved on the crime. Garvie oddly enough says that "an explicit reference to the Resurrection, we may be sure, was not intended by Jesus at the time." It would be easier to appraise the value of this opinion if the learned writer had told us on what grounds we might base our certainty.

On the other hand there are weighty arguments in favour of the chronological placing of the Cleansing in the Fourth Gospel. Whether that Gospel is or is not the work of an Apostle, it is certain that none of the Synoptic Gospels in its present form, and least of all the historical outline of those Gospels, emanates from an Apostle. Mark, whose gospel in its original form is the historical prototype of the Synoptics, wrote on the basis of Peter's preaching at a time when Peter was either already dead or at least not available for consultation. Mark had formed the idea that Jesus visited Jerusalem once only after the beginning of His public ministry and, since the Cleansing of the Temple had to be placed at Jerusalem, it could on his view only be an incident of the closing days. What Mark records is perfectly consistent, given his view of the relations between Jesus and Jerusalem, with Peter having associated the Cleansing in his preaching with the first visit of our Lord to Jerusalem during the ministry. If moreover Howard is right in suggesting that the story of the Cleansing of the Temple did not appear in Proto-Luke, the fact may be significant in this connection.

For some reason the exact nature of which has already been discussed the Synoptists omit from their narratives all mention of the Raising of Lazarus, while in the Fourth Gospel it appears as the immediate cause of the arrest of Jesus. With the omission of this miracle the rapid progress of events in the closing days of the earthly life of Jesus becomes inexplicable. The Synoptic Gospels were put into their present form at a time and in circles in which the chronological sequence of events had been lost for the most part, and it is not surprising that the Evangelist Mark should have looked around

for some explanation and found it in the reaction excited by the Cleansing of the Temple. Even on the assumption that he was wrong chronologically, his choice did no real violence to history. Although Schmiedel says that "no officials could allow their sacred rights to be interfered with in this way without letting all authority slip out of their hands," it is probably incorrect to believe that the Cleansing of the Temple must necessarily have provoked an immediate explosion. Monopolists are seldom popular, and the monopoly of the family of Annas in this connection can hardly have evoked enthusiastic support. At the same time by His action Jesus had brought upon Himself the enmity of powerful opponents who, although they could not destroy Him immediately, were unlikely to forget and would bide their time. The Crucifixion cannot be attributed to a single cause, but from the moment that He had cleansed the Temple, the fate of Jesus was humanly speaking inevitable, unless He had withdrawn into a permanent obscurity; and this is true notwithstanding that the forces at work took a long time to produce their inevitable result, as they did on the assumption that there was only one cleansing of the Temple and that it is correctly placed in the Fourth Gospel. That the Fourth Evangelist regarded the matter in this light is borne out by the reference to Psalm LXIX, 9—"The zeal of Thine House hath eaten me up"—in John II, 17. We must not read into this passage a meaning other than that which it would have conveyed to the disciples. It is not mere enthusiasm that is here portrayed, but the road to the death on the Cross. As Hoskyns points out, the word translated "eat up," in addition to meaning that the mind is strongly moved, suggests also destruction. He cites Revelation XI, 5 and XX, 9.

Then again, is the Cleansing of the Temple in fact more appropriate to the period of the Triumphal Entry? In the Synoptics the Cleansing is closely connected with the enquiry put to Jesus by the chief priests, scribes and elders—"By what authority doest Thou these things?" (Mark XI, 28). Such an enquiry is surely out of place immediately after the enthusiastic salutation of the masses recorded a few verses previously—"Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." (Mark XI, 9).

Further, while it may be true that the fact of quotation presupposes a recent utterance, the case before us is not one of quotation but of misquotation. At this point the version of the Cleansing to be found in the Fourth Gospel fits in remarkably with the Synoptics. As P. V. Smith points out, no hint is given in either Matthew or Mark of Jesus ever having used words to which the meaning of Matthew XXVI, 61—"I am able to destroy the temple of God and to build it in three days"—and Mark XIV, 58—"I will destroy this temple that is made with hands and within three days I will build another made without hands"—could be attached. It is the Fourth Gospel that discloses the real words of Jesus—"Destroy this temple, and in three days I

will raise it up" (John II, 19). Surely it is easier for a misquotation to pass muster after an interval of time than immediately after the words it purports to record were uttered. The witnesses moreover did not agree in their recollection of the saying of Jesus (Mark XIV, 59), and this is another fact pointing in the same direction.

Finally, the Fourth Gospel gives us a valuable note of time when it records the saying of the Jews—"Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt Thou rear it up in three days?" (John II, 20). By a curiosity of criticism Renan thought that this verse fixed the age of Jesus. In fact it cannot record the duration of the complete process of building the temple, for we know that the building of the temple commenced in 19 B. C. and that the work was not finished until the time of the procurator Albinus about 63 A. D. Forty-six years must therefore be the period during which the incomplete temple had been in process of construction at the time of the Cleansing. This brings the date of the Cleansing to 27 A. D. (Drummond) or 28 A. D. (Lagrange) and, if the Crucifixion is correctly placed in 30 A. D., puts the Cleansing at the beginning of the ministry. Unless we are prepared to accept the extreme view that the saying is a fabrication of the Evangelist, this is weighty evidence.

We shall from time to time have to notice the suggestion that the Fourth Gospel has suffered disarrangement. Archbishop Bernard thought it possible that the page relating to the Cleansing of the Temple had as a result been transferred from the end to the beginning of the Gospel. This involves however a larger measure of disarrangement than others who have specialized in this branch of the subject are disposed to admit, and the work of these scholars lends no support to the Archbishop's suggestion.

NOTES ON CHAPTER II:

- (1) Sadler, *Gospel of St. John* (1891), page xxxiii.
- (2) *Johannine Writings*, page 94.
- (3) *Idem*, page 18.
- (4) Bernard cites only one tradition, that recorded by Epiphanius to the effect that Lazarus lived for thirty years after the miracle. This can hardly be decisive.

**THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE SYNOPTICS (CONT'D.)—
JESUS' CONSCIOUSNESS OF HIS MESSIAHSHIP. JESUS GOD
OR MAN? THE STYLE OF JESUS. THE THEME OF JESUS'
PREACHING. REPENTANCE OR RECONCILIATION? THE
OBLIGATION OF THE CHRISTIAN. TO WHOM DID JESUS
APPEAL? THE PURPOSE OF JESUS' MIRACLES.**

According to Wright the second crucial difference between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics turns upon Jesus' consciousness of His Messiahship or, as we might perhaps better express the alleged difference, the recognition of His Divine Sonship.

It is commonly said that in the Synoptics Jesus undergoes a gradual process of self-discovery, while, as Burch puts the matter, the structure of the Fourth Gospel appears to preclude the idea of the development of intellectual or moral depth in the revelation of Jesus. Burch indeed cannot conceive that Jesus would have had to learn from the chances and changes of His short life what He came to teach.

The Fourth Gospel, apart from the prologue, first presents Jesus to us as a grown man, and the question between it and the Synoptics is therefore limited to Jesus' consciousness during the period of the Ministry. From the Johannine point of view Jesus can hardly have been unaware of His pre-existence in the Godhead as the heavenly Logos. On the other hand the Jesus of the Synoptics is recognized from the first as a very remarkable being. On the most restricted view of the range of powers of the earthly Jesus He can hardly have been unaware of the testimonies of Simeon and Anna spoken "to all them that looked for redemption in Israel" (Luke II), and the question put by Him at the age of twelve—"Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?"—shows that at that age He had, according to the Synoptics, already recognized His Divine Sonship. It seems indeed inconceivable that He could have been unaware of it in face of the recognition of His unique personality by others. In the very first chapter of the Fourth Gospel Jesus is saluted as Lamb of God, Messiah and Son of God. Throughout the Gospel He is fully conscious of His divine nature and mission. But is the Synoptic representation really different? In the Synoptic Gospels Jesus is recognized by the devils from the first, and even in Mark Jesus understands and explains why (Mark III, 22-27). If Mark's Gospel stood alone, it would be just arguable that among mortals Jesus was not recognized for what He was until a late period in His ministry and that even then the recognition was at first limited to a narrow circle of carefully-trained disciples. The inference is however one from silence, and it is to be observed that Matthew and Luke do not so understand Mark, or at least do not follow him. We must therefore ask whether the argument from silence is valid here. Is it conceivable that no idea of Jesus' real nature entered the minds of the disciples when they heard Him

claim to forgive sins and to be Lord of the Sabbath, when they saw Him heal the sick and raise the dead, when they felt—instinctively perhaps—that He was One Who could still the angry tempest? It is easy to say that in fact they neither saw nor felt anything of the sort, but, if Mark is wrong on such points as these, is it safe to appeal to him at all? It is surely wrong to accept those parts of a narrative which one thinks point to the conclusions at which one wishes to arrive and to reject those parts which seem to point in the opposite direction. On the basis of Mark's representation some recognition of Jesus' real nature must have preceded Peter's great confession at Caesarea Philippi, but it may well have been a fleeting recognition, and the narrative in the Fourth Gospel is certainly not inconsistent with this view of the matter. The real significance of the scene at Caesarea Philippi is not that it marks the first recognition of Jesus' real nature, but that it is the beginning of a more settled and permanent conviction.

This brings us to a consideration of the real nature of Jesus as it is depicted for us in the Gospels. Here again it is suggested that there is a fundamental discrepancy between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. Stated in its extreme form the alleged discrepancy is this—Here a man, there a God. We have therefore to ask ourselves whether it is substantially true that Mark exhibits to us the picture of a man and the Fourth Gospel the picture of a God. Firstly, let us examine the evidence of Jesus' divinity in Mark's representation. The picture is evidently that of One Who claimed divinity by implication (X, 18; XII, 1-9). Schmiedel indeed describes the saying of Jesus in X, 18—"Why callest thou Me good? There is none good but One, that is, God"—as "words of Jesus to the effect that He did not deserve to be called good," and others (some of whom ought to have known better) have taken the same line. The real meaning of the saying is clear. It is a cry wrung from the lips of One Who knows that He, and He alone, can save guilty sinners, and Who cannot bear the thought that His free gift of eternal life here and hereafter should be ignored or rejected. Who can miss the pathos of the implied appeal—Can't you, won't you, see that I, Jesus, am God? In addition the Jesus of Mark's Gospel claims separately some of the prerogatives of divinity—to forgive sin (II, 10); to be Lord of the Sabbath (II, 28); to come in the glory of the Father with the Holy Angels (VIII, 38); and to amend the Law given by God to Moses (X, 2-9). He was moreover acknowledged by the Father (I, 11), by man (XV, 39), and by the spirit world (III, 11 and elsewhere) to be the Son of God. John the Baptist declared of Him that He should baptise with the Holy Spirit (I, 8). He impressed men with a sense of His uniqueness (II, 12) and was acknowledged to have "done all things well" (VII, 37). He commanded with authority the unclean spirits and they obeyed Him (I, 27), conferred on others the authority He Himself possessed over those spirits (VI, 7) healed many that were sick with divers diseases (I, 34), stilled the fury of the wind and sea

(IV, 39)); raised the dead (V, 42), made the deaf hear and the dumb speak (VII, 37), multiplied loaves and fishes (VI, 43), walked on the sea (VI, 48), was transfigured (IX, 2), caused a fig tree to wither by His word (XI, 21), told "all things beforehand" (XIII, 23) and finally rose from the dead (XVI, 6). Schmiedel reproaches "those who still place the Fourth Gospel on a higher level than the other three" with wishing that the picture of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel were not so like a God (Johannine Writings, page 30). Is not the Marcan picture also the picture of a God? It is the picture of a God because Jesus was God. It is certainly open to anyone to say that the picture is not historical, but, if one holds that view of Mark, then, as we have already remarked elsewhere, one ought not to use his picture in an attempt to discredit the Fourth Gospel.

Now let us examine the evidence of Jesus' manhood as presented in the Fourth Gospel. This side of His nature is not emphasised in the Fourth Gospel. Its portrait too is that of a God, but it is the portrait of God made man. Though they are not emphasised, the human characteristics are also there. Jesus describes Himself as "a man" (VIII, 40), suffers fatigue (IV, 6), gives way to sorrow (XI, 35), suffers thirst (XIX, 28)—as to the reality of the thirst more must be said presently—and dies (XIX, 30). Blood pours from His pierced side (XIX, 34). The difference between Mark and the Fourth Gospel, so far as this point is concerned, is one of emphasis. If we find that the author of the Fourth Gospel had a more intimate personal knowledge of Jesus and a deeper spiritual insight, the difference calls for no further explanation.

The Jesus of the Fourth Gospel may seem to some to wield a mightier power than the Jesus of the Synoptics. This is not altogether the case; rather should we say that certain attributes of which the Synoptists were well aware find fuller expression in the Fourth Gospel. If it were true, however, is it to the Jesus Who wills to save, or to the Jesus Who is able to save, that mankind bows the knee? Surely it is to the Jesus Who both wills and is able to save. In the picture of this Jesus the Fourth Gospel gives clearer definition to certain essential traits.

Another difference between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel concerns the style of Jesus, the form in which He clothed the teaching He had to give. As Schmiedel puts the matter—"In the first three Gospels we have short pithy utterances. In the Fourth Gospel no more than a few of these utterances reappear. Everywhere else in this gospel we find long spun-out discourses, which moreover are repeated on the most varied occasions" (Johannine Writings, page 35). In the Synoptic Gospels we are met by those gems of literature, our Lord's inimitable parables. In the Fourth Gospel not one of them is to be found, for the so-called parables of the Good Shepherd and the Vine are not parables in the strict sense of the word. On this question of parable or angry disputation the Fourth Gospel is

plainly on the defensive. No one doubts that the lovely parables attributed to Him are genuine utterances of Jèsus; the question is whether on other occasions He spoke in such an essentially different style. P. V. Smith thinks that He did and indicates one of the reasons for the difference when he says, "Jesus would adopt a different style in addressing the simple peasantry of Galilee and the contentious Jews of Jerusalem." Again Garvie writes, "In Judaea Jesus . . . exercised less reserve than in Galilee, for the peril of a mistaken Messianic movement was absent, and He gave more advanced teaching doctrinally, as He was addressing Himself to a learned class." The voice of modern Jewish scholarship too calls for consideration. Let us listen to Dr. Israel Abrahams, the great rabbinic scholar—"Most remarkable has been the cumulative strength of the arguments adduced by Jewish writers favourable to the authenticity of the discourses in the Fourth Gospel. My own general impression . . . is that the Gospel enshrines a genuine tradition of an aspect of Jesus' teaching which has not found a place in the Synoptics." We need not however rely on the opinion of a modern writer. The Synoptic Gospels themselves bear witness to the changes of style, though in the passage now to be quoted the audiences contrasted are the multitude and the disciples. In Mark IV, 34 we read, "But without a parable spake He not unto them; and when they were alone He expounded all things to His disciples." Further, in Matthew XIII, 13 and 16 appear the words, "Therefore spake to them in parables; because they, seeing, see not . . . but blessed are your (the disciples') eyes, for they see," and in Luke VIII, 10, "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of God; but to others in parables." The real question at issue being, not whether parables were a feature of Jesus' teaching, but whether He also used the controversial style of the Fourth Gospel, conclusive evidence appears to be furnished by the occurrence of the latter in certain passages in the Synoptics. The long denunciations of Mark VII, 5-13 and Luke XI, 39-54 read like pages of the Fourth Gospel, and the words of Mark XII, 24—"Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God"—reproduce that Gospel's exact method of attack.

Wendt and Soltau held that the discourses in the Fourth Gospel existed as a separate collection before the remainder of the Gospel was compiled, and we shall have occasion to recur to this opinion of Jesus and that of the Evangelist will also come up for discussion. We should however consider at the present stage how far the Fourth Gospel can be held to record actual utterances of Jesus. The ipsissima verba of Jesus are certainly not to be found in the Gospel, for Jesus spoke in Aramaic, and the Gospel, as we have it, is written in Greek. At this point too is to be considered the existence of variant readings in the Greek text. A more far-reaching charge is however sometimes brought. In its most extreme form it is

put by Carpenter as follows—"The discourses of Jesus are not the authoritative deliverances of the Eternal Word; they are the testimonies of faith." Something less is claimed by Garvie when he writes, "One cannot suppress the conviction that the Evangelist has not only at times transferred to the lips of Jesus his own inferences from the relation of the Father to the Son as he conceived it, but has given to Jesus a certain artificial pose of the debater and controversialist which places Him in a less attractive light than do the Synoptics." Gentler still is the criticism of Monsignor Ruch, Bishop of Strasbourg, who holds that "the thoughts of the Incarnate Word have been clothed by the Evangelist in a characteristic literary form peculiar to himself."

We need not adopt any of these suggestions. Burney points out that exactly the same poetic forms clothe the teaching of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel as in the Synoptics. Some of these are audible only to the trained ear, but others may be perceived on the most casual reading. The refrain, "And I will raise him up at the last day," ringing through the sixth chapter of the Fourth Gospel is forcibly reminiscent of the very different phrase, "Where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched," in the ninth chapter of Mark. We must moreover bear in mind the greater antiquity of the Johannine discourses in the opinion of Wendt and Soltau just mentioned. If the Evangelist was the Apostle John (which will become a cardinal issue later), there is no reason why he should not have made notes of the discourses of Jesus at or about the time of their deliverance. Furthermore, we have to take account of the retentive memories of the East, far surpassing those of the West, where Lord Macaulay is said to have memorised Homer, and the fact that in recalling the utterances of his Lord the Evangelist had the aid of the Holy Spirit—"The Holy Spirit Whom the Father will send in My name, He shall . . . bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you" (John XIV, 26),

From the consideration of the form of Jesus' preaching one passes naturally to that of its subject matter. Here again there is alleged to be a conflict between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. In the former, we are told, Jesus speaks of His person and the eternal life which He offers; in the latter His theme is the Kingdom. As Burch points out, "The Kingdom was not a subject Jesus dwelt on (it would perhaps be better to say a term He used frequently to convey His revelation of the Father) in His Judaean ministry. It was a plastic means of conveying His teaching to ordinary folk in ordinary scenes of life." In the Fourth Gospel eternal life is a constant theme of His preaching. It is present in Him (I, 4) and is so far a part of the divine nature that it can be identified with Him (XI, 25). The natural lot of man is death (III, 16; V, 24), but eternal life is the fruit of "belief" (VI, 47), for Jesus has authority to bestow it upon whomsoever the Father hath given Him and it is the will of the Father that everyone that beholdeth the Son and believeth on Him should

have it. The passage from unbelief to belief is a new birth (III,3). The death of Jesus is a necessary condition of His authority to bestow eternal life (III, 14-15), and men may co-operate with God in bringing others to this life (IV, 36). In the Synoptics this detailed teaching is absent, though Howard can say that "we know from them that 'eternal life' was sometimes used by Jesus or those who addressed Him as equivalent to 'the Kingdom of God'" and, as Garvie puts it, "eternal life appears as a goal even in the Synoptics." Certainly the term "eternal life" is familiar to the Synoptists. The question what shall be done to secure it is put to Jesus in each of the first three Gospels (Matthew XIX, 16; Mark X, 17; Luke X, 25), and Jesus Himself declares some of the conditions on which a man may "receive . . . in the world to come eternal life" (Mark X, 30). It is true that the viewpoint is not quite the same as in the Fourth Gospel, for eternal life is thought of in the Marcan story as a prospective rather than as a present possession, but it is of its permanence rather than of its futurity that Jesus is giving assurance. On the other hand even in the Fourth Gospel the Kingdom is mentioned in the conversation with Nicodemus (John III, 3, 5). Once again the difference is one of emphasis, perhaps even of phraseology.

As regards the Johannine emphasis on the Person of Jesus, Schmiedel has indicated, without grasping, the real solution when he says that "in the Synoptics even where Jesus speaks of His own Person . . . He does not say this for His own sake, but on account of those whom He wishes by speaking thus to lead into the right path" (Johannine Writings, page 37). This is precisely the position in the Fourth Gospel. Jesus insists upon the acknowledgment of His personal attributes, not from any motive of vainglory, but because He knows that He and He alone can save ("No man cometh unto the Father but by Me"—John XIV, 6), and He cannot bear the thought that men should reject or ignore what He offers.

It is further urged that Jesus' purpose in the Synoptics is to bring men to repentance (Matthew IV, 17 and IX, 13; Luke XIII, 5), while in the Fourth Gospel it is the reconciliation of man with God. Such distinctions bespeak too narrow a view of the range of Jesus' message. We must repent in order that we may be reconciled with God.

No more serious is the alleged difference between the obligation of the Christian as defined in the Synoptics and in the Fourth Gospel respectively. This is said to be love towards all men in the former, and love towards one's fellow Christians in the latter. It is true that Luke VI, 32 repudiates any limitation when it records the words of Jesus, "If ye love them that love you, what thank have ye, for sinners also love those that love them?" Scott, however, goes too far when he says that in the Fourth Gospel "the love (of the disciples) is not to be to all men but only to one another," and so does Lord Charnwood in writing, "The fire of love that glows within the barrier

is limited in the range of its worth by a very solid barrier that shuts out the world." In the Synoptics a special interest is the love that is as wide as the wide, wide world and embraces all humanity, while the Fourth Gospel is concerned with love within a narrower circle. The two are not however mutually exclusive, as we may see from a familiar example drawn from every-day life. The father of a family has a special love for those of his own little family circle, but this special love does not rule out the possibility of a wider love for his church, his country and his fellow men as such.

Yet another difference concerns the sort of people to whom Jesus made His appeal. The Jesus we meet in the pages of the Synoptics "came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance" (Mark II, 17), while, according to Jackson, in the Fourth Gospel Jesus' "disciples are no longer rescued sinners but seekers after truth; good people and not sinners flock to hear His words" (The Fourth Gospel and some recent German criticism, 1906). The contrast is not however so absolute as some would have us believe. While Luke tells us in XV, 1, "Then drew near to Him all the publicans and sinners for to hear Him," there are other passages in the Synoptics that bring us into contact with a very different class of people. Such among others are Luke VI, 32, which contrasts "you which hear" with "sinners," and Luke XVIII, 9, which reads as follows:—"And He spake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous . . ." Worth indeed, according to the Synoptic record, is a special ground for the rendering of a service to or by Jesus. "Enquire who in it is worthy and there abide," says Jesus in Matthew X, 11; and in Luke VII, 4 we are told that "they came to Jesus saying that he was worthy for whom He should do this." On the other hand Burch with his usual insight says, "The economy of John's description of Jesus' extra-Judaeian ministry does not mean that he wants to keep Jesus from entering lowly doors and lives. He would never have included in his Gospel the home in Bethany or ordinary men and women merely wanting physical food, had that been His desire" (Structure, page 220). The cast-iron wall of partition erected by the critics crumbles once more in face of the facts. In the Fourth Gospel men are looked at in the light of the great fact of Jesus' atonement. It is only by virtue of that atonement that they can be reckoned righteous.

The purpose of Jesus' miracles next demands our attention. Were they works of mercy or demonstrations of power? Was faith a prerequisite or an intended result? The Synoptists evidently incline to the former of these alternatives in each case. Their typical view of the matter is summed up in Mark I, 44—"See that thou say nothing to any man"—and several similar injunctions elsewhere, and in Matthew IX, 28 and 29—"Believe ye that I am able to do this? . . . According to your faith be it unto you." In contrast to this we have the dicta of Wernle that "the fact of their (the Johannine miracles) actual occurrence is the irrefragable proof of God's appearance on

earth" and of Lord Charnwood that "His works of mercy (according to the Fourth Gospel) are worked in order to compel belief," from which we should expect them to be given the widest possible publicity. Wendt too describes the Johannine miracles as "not tokens of His love but tokens of His wonderful power." The contrast is not however so clear-cut as these scholars would have us believe. While Jesus often tells those upon whom the Synoptic miracles are performed to see that no man knows, there are other occasions on which He sanctions and even enjoins publicity. Such are Luke VII, 22—"Go your way and tell John what things ye have seen and heard, how that the blind see," etc., etc.—and Luke VIII, 39—"Return to thine own house and show how great things God hath done unto thee." Further, in Luke V, 24 the purpose so strikingly illustrated in the Fourth Gospel is paralleled in Jesus' words, "But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power upon earth to forgive sins . . . I say unto thee, Arise." At first sight Mark VIII, 12—"There shall no sign be given unto this generation" seems strong evidence against the use of miracle as a demonstration of power, and we must not overlook the fact that the miracles recorded in the Fourth Gospel are described as "signs." Mark VIII, 12 is indeed paralleled in Matthew XVI, 4 and Luke XI, 29, so that the Synoptists speak with a united voice. We must not however understand the word "generation" as here used as though it included all of Jesus' contemporaries. Jesus is here referring to the Pharisees and Sadducees, and not to a wider circle, and this suggested limitation is supported by the words of Jesus in Matthew XVII, 17—"O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? How long shall I suffer you?"—where the generation referred to is evidently the disciples. There is thus substantial evidence in the Synoptics for the Johannine representation of the purpose of miracle, though we must not assume that every miracle had the same purpose.

Whether faith be conceived of as the prerequisite or the intended result of a miracle, it is important that we should have a clear idea of the nature of faith. We are asked to believe that the faith demanded according to the Synoptics is a belief in Jesus' ability to do something, while what is called for in the Fourth Gospel, which does not actually use the word "faith" on a single occasion, is belief on Jesus as the Son of God. The Fourth Gospel seems in fact to distinguish between degrees of belief according as the "believer" actually became a disciple or was favorably impressed without committing himself to a definite decision, and the object of the Johannine "sign" is to induce belief in the fullest sense. There is however no real contrast between belief conceived of as belief in Jesus' ability to do or give something and belief on Jesus as the Son of God. There must be a ground for every belief, and the ground for believing that Jesus is able to do or to give may well be that He is the Son of God.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE SYNOPTICS (Continued). THE SCENE OF JESUS' MINISTRY. ITS DURATION. CALL OF THE APOSTLES. JOHN THE BAPTIST. THE TRIAL OF JESUS. DAY AND HOUR OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

In the course of our comparison between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics we now come to two questions of quite a different nature. What was the principal scene of Jesus' ministry? Was it Galilee, as we should glean from the Synoptics, or Judaea, as indicated in the Fourth Gospel? And did that ministry last for one year or three?

In contrast to the Synoptists the author of the Fourth Gospel, as Gardner-Smith puts the matter, "clearly regards Jerusalem as the proper scene of the activities of the Christ, and Galilee as a district in which Jesus walked for brief periods when retirement from Judaea was made necessary by the hostility of the Jews." We must however be careful not to overstate the contrast. This is what Schmiedel does when he writes, "According to the Synoptics Jesus did not come to Jerusalem or to Judaea at all . . . until a few days before His death" (Johannine Writings, page 10). What Schmiedel really meant is "For anything that the Synoptics tell us to the contrary Jesus did not come to Jerusalem or to Judaea at all during the course of His public ministry until a few days before His death." This is a very different matter. Schmiedel pushes the argument from silence to an absurd degree when he equates silence with a definite negation, and the insertion of the limitation to the period of the public ministry is clearly necessitated by Luke II, 42-49, to go no further. Nothing that the Synoptists say precludes us from believing in the existence of a public ministry in Jerusalem, and no one has ever suggested that there was no public ministry in Galilee.

We must therefore examine the evidence to see whether there is any incidental support, either on grounds of probability or in the pages of the Synoptics, for the representation of the Fourth Gospel. In his work "The Beloved Disciple" Garvie made out a good case for the acceptance of that representation. After pointing out that "the completeness of the Synoptic record is an assumption which the results of modern scholarship are more and more disproving," he goes on to suggest that Peter (the main authority behind Mark) "may have said nothing about the visits to Jerusalem because he had nothing to report as an eyewitness." He then makes the point that "it is not only probable but even certain that Jesus as the Messiah of the Jewish nation could not be content to offer Himself for its acceptance or rejection to the comparatively insignificant province of Galilee." Renan had already claimed that the stays in Jerusalem reported in the Fourth Gospel constitute "a decisive triumph" for that Gospel, as without them it would be impossible to explain how Christianity

came to issue from Jerusalem instead of from Galilee. Further, as Garvie goes on to point out, "the Synoptic record of the last visit to Jerusalem presupposes a previous ministry there." Sadler says in this connection that the four days' ministry in Jerusalem described by the Synoptics seems "far too short a time to bring down upon Him such an extremity of wrath and hatred as culminated in His crucifixion" (St. John's Gospel, page xxxv). The lament over Jerusalem recorded in Matthew XXIII, 37 "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together . . . and ye would not" (see also Luke XIII, 34) can only be accounted for on the assumption that Jesus had made previous appeals to the capital city of Judaism. It is true that Jackson would make the lament one for the Jewish nation as a whole rather than for Jerusalem in particular, but this seems fanciful. Schmiedel would explain away the words in a different way. He writes, "The whole confirmation of John's story of many visits of Jesus to Jerusalem rests solely on the fact that an utterance put into the mouth of the Wisdom of God by a Jewish author has been wrongly regarded as a saying of Jesus" (Johannine Writings, page 61). This is an overstatement of the kind to which the reader of Schmiedel grows accustomed. As we have seen and shall see, there is abundant confirmation of earlier visits to Jerusalem, apart from the lament attributed to Jesus, but the whole point is taken out of Schmiedel's argument when we reflect that the fact (if it be a fact) that the words in question had been used by a Jewish writer before Him affords no ground for assuming that Jesus did not repeat them. He was always ready to make use of what was best in the thought of His own and previous generations, and a familiar phrase (if such it was) may have seemed to Him peculiarly appropriate to this occasion.

Then again, as Scott Holland remarks, "the Synoptics tell of devoted disciples, friends and lovers whom Jesus already possessed in Jerusalem." The story of the taking of the colt for the triumphal entry (Mark XI, 1-6, with parallels in Matthew XXI and Luke XIX) and that of the reservation of the guest chamber (Mark XIV, 12-16, with parallels in Matthew XXVI and LUKE XXII) afford clear evidence of the existence of adherents of Jesus in and around Jerusalem, and what can be more probable than that these were won on previous visits to the neighborhood? Scott Holland well sums up the situation when he writes, "Jesus does not go to offer His Gospel to Jerusalem. All that is over."

A further argument by Garvie that John I, 11 indicates a Judæan and not a Galilean is unfortunately based on a misunderstanding of the sequence of thought in the passage of which this verse forms part, while the variant reading, "He preached in the synagogues of Judæa" in Luke IV, 44 is too insecure to afford a basis for argument, though it may have been influenced by a tradition.

Drummond, who takes an unfavourable view of the historicity of

the Fourth Gospel, writes, "The more John ran counter to the tradition the less likely was he to be misunderstood. From this point of view there would be an obvious propriety in removing the chief controversies to Jerusalem." The view we take of this suggestion will depend on our estimate of the value of Drummond's premises, and this is a matter to which we shall have to give attention later. Quite apart, however, from the evidence of the Fourth Gospel itself, the case for the actuality of earlier visits of Jesus to Jerusalem will be seen to be very strong indeed.

We must now pass to the question of the duration of Jesus' public ministry. The Synoptists mention only one Passover as falling within this period, and they are commonly regarded as based on the view that the public ministry lasted for one year only. To this view the words of Jesus recorded in Luke IV, 18-19—"The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me because He hath appointed Me . . . to preach the acceptable year of the Lord"—are thought to lend support. Lagrange rather strangely thinks that the careful dating of the Baptist's ministry in Luke III, 1-2 is intended to fix the date of the death on the Cross, and another authority in Dr. Briggs is recorded to have told Carpenter that he believed all the three Passovers recorded in the Fourth Gospel as included in the public ministry to be one and the same, the order of this Gospel being in his judgment topical and not chronological. Loisy and others point out that three years and a few months constitute a *demi-semaine d'annees*, the Messianic figure par excellence according to Daniel and the Apocalypse. This is very attractive to those who see symbolism and allegory on every page of the Fourth Gospel, but its value as evidence is diminished when one reflects that the duration of the ministry according to that Gospel is a little less, rather than a little more, than three years.

We must remember moreover that the Synoptists nowhere state in so many words that the public ministry lasted only for a single year, though their scheme of events seems to fall naturally into that period. If, however, Jesus went up to Jerusalem on the occasion of each Passover, the Synoptists, who until they reach the final scenes confine themselves to events in Galilee, would naturally lack these notes of time. The words of a parable recorded in Luke XIII, 7—"Behold these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree"—may nevertheless point to a three years' ministry. The main consideration affecting the question of duration arises however from the general chronological uncertainty of the Synoptists. There seems no doubt that the preaching of Peter, on which Mark mainly relied, did not set out events in exact chronological sequence, and Matthew and even more Luke were dissatisfied with Mark's order of events. On these grounds Burch holds that John's chronological scheme is better and that we must "straighten out the seeming temporal inaccuracies of the first three Gospels by the help of the chronology that gives precision to the Gospel of John." (Structure, page 220).

When one compares the accounts of the call of the first Apostles

in the four Gospels it is impossible not to be impressed by the striking differences. While Matthew (IV, 18-22) substantially follows the account of Mark (I, 16-20), Luke (V, 1-11) gives the circumstances in much greater detail, and John's story differs from all three so fundamentally that it seems to describe another event. This is precisely what we shall find it to do. Both Lord Charnwood and Lagrange hold that John's story is more natural than that of the Synoptists, but we are not called upon to choose. Lord Charnwood expresses the opinion that "disciples do not abruptly change their lives on the sudden apparition of a commanding figure, as in Mark, nor upon the persuasion of a miracle, as in Luke." The experience of Saul of Tarsus would not appear easy to reconcile with this view of the possibilities, and Lord Charnwood has clearly overstated his case, but there certainly is an element of abruptness in the Marcan story. If the meeting recorded by Mark was the first meeting between Jesus and His principal disciples, their instant obedience is at least surprising, but, if the events recorded in John I had taken place at a previous date, all difficulty vanishes. As Jackson puts the matter, "The otherwise unexplained readiness of Simon, Andrew and the sons of Zebedee to obey the call of Jesus in the Synoptic story is accounted for by a discipleship which dated back to that earlier stage of the ministry told of by the Fourth Evangelist." It is impossible to find in the Gospels a clearer case of apparently discordant accounts being explained by their reference to different events. What must have happened was that the disciples were first enlisted in the army of Jesus and then called up for active service.

Quite different considerations arise in the case of the relationship of John the Baptist to Jesus. Here a conflict is thought to arise between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel in that (it is said) the latter deliberately disparages the Baptist with a view to the aggrandisement of Jesus. Gardner-Smith writes—"The Q passage incorporated in the First and Third Gospels is sufficiently near to history to give a picture of the Baptist as a prophet of righteousness in his own right. In the Fourth Gospel . . . John . . . is but a witness whose sole function is to testify to Jesus as the Lamb of God." The humility of the Baptist towards Jesus however already finds expression in the earliest of the Synoptics—"There cometh One mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. I indeed have baptised you with water; but He shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost." On the other hand in the Fourth Gospel Jesus, while refusing to base His claims on the testimony of the Baptist, describes the latter as "a burning and a shining light" in which men were "willing to rejoice for a season." We must not read the Baptist's words in John I, 31—"That He should be made manifest to Israel therefore am I come baptising with water"—as limiting the mission of the Forerunner to the fulfilment of a single object. There are indeed expressions in the account given in

the Fourth Gospel which would lead one to suppose that the Evangelist was himself once a disciple of the Baptist and an actual hearer of his testimony to Jesus. Lord Charnwood notes the feeling of surprise, possibly still vivid in the writer's mind long after the confession was made and eloquently portrayed in the phrase "He confessed, and denied not, but confessed, I am not the Christ." (John I, 20). He further remarks that "the moving words, He must increase, but I must decrease (John III, 30), have the ring of nature, not of art."

An objection to the Johannine representation is voiced by Wendt, who says that "doubt of such a kind (as is implied by the question 'Art Thou He that cometh, or look we for another?') would be psychologically inconceivable if the Baptist had first obtained his knowledge of the Messiahship of Jesus through an express divine revelation and if he had himself acclaimed Jesus as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, and thereby confessed the necessity for Messianic suffering in fulfilment of Isaiah LIII." There is some confusion of thought here, for it is the Baptist's own plight, and not the sufferings of the Messiah, that provokes the question. As Lagrange points out, moreover, "a first enthusiasm and a conviction founded on reflection are very far apart." Surely a man's insight into the divine purpose is rarely if ever a constant quality. In which of us has not the exultation of faith been followed by the dark hour of depression and, it may be, of unbelief? Need we doubt that the Baptist had this almost universal experience?

Loisy and Bultmann would indeed remove any further necessity for contrasting the Synoptic and Johannine representations. To Loisy John the Baptist is a name for a literary creation which is meant to serve a Christological creation with the name Jesus, while Bultmann causes the Fourth Evangelist to create a Christ from Mandaean literature and from an historic figure in that religion whose name was John the Baptist. Misrepresentation of this kind could not have passed unchallenged so soon after the event: it would have brought its own refutation and harmed the cause it was designed to serve. Moreover, Burch, on the basis of a careful examination of the evidence, arrives at the conclusion that the Mandaean Johannesbuch arose out of the Fourth Gospel and not vice versa.

On the facts before us it is difficult to resist the conclusion that, notwithstanding some differences of representation, there is no real conflict between the Gospels as to John the Baptist and the attitude of Jesus and John towards one another.

A larger and more important question faces us when we go on to consider the details of the trial and crucifixion of Jesus and the events which surrounded them. A certain difference of representation, particularly with regard to the details, was inevitable in the case of events spread over so long a period of time and happening in such circumstances. We are now concerned with the credibility of the account given in the Fourth Gospel, and in this connection

it is interesting to note Burch's reference to John's "naturally-told account of the trial" and the opinion of Archbishop Bernard, who declared that "throughout the Johannine account of the Crucifixion the fuller testimony of an eyewitness reveals itself." Let us examine a few of the divergences between the Synoptic and Johannine stories with a view to determining how far they justify or discredit the latter. In the Fourth Gospel alone the part played by the Romans is adequately brought out. In it alone the Romans ("the band") take part in the arrest of Jesus, and it alone tells us that the power to impose a sentence of death was vested solely in Pilate. In the Fourth Gospel Judas' kiss of betrayal is not mentioned, but this is probably because the Evangelist or his authority did not see it, for Judas is treated so severely in this Gospel that a circumstance of this nature, aggravating as it did his offence, could hardly have been omitted for any other reason. Then in the Fourth Gospel alone mention is made of the pursuing force going backward and falling to the ground (John XVIII, 6). We need not assume however that the circumstance was invented by the Evangelist with the object of magnifying the majesty of Jesus. Mockery is indeed more likely to have impelled the act, and it need not be inferred that the whole of the pursuing force participated in it. A further piece of information exclusively derived from the Fourth Gospel is the name (Malchus) of the high priest's servant whose ear Peter severed. On the other hand this Gospel does not mention the restoration of the ear, a circumstance which it would certainly have mentioned had its sole object been to extol the power of Jesus. It does mention that the doorkeeper was a woman, and this, as P. V. Smith points out, strikes a note of authenticity. Archbishop Bernard makes the further point that the Fourth Gospel gives a less severe account of Peter's lapse than do the Synoptics. According to Mark (XIV, 72) the prophecy uttered by Jesus was "Before the cock crows TWICE thou shalt deny Me thrice." Peter therefore had a reminder of his danger when the cock crowed for the first time, and his offence is consequently worsened. Moreover, the Fourth Gospel makes no mention of Peter's outburst of bad language (Mark XIV, 71). Finally, it is the Gospel which alone records Peter's rehabilitation, though here the relation of the twenty-first chapter to the rest of the Gospel has to be considered. Bernard points out that the Synoptists represent Peter as sitting, while John represents him as standing, but a man may be allowed to change his posture.

Sadler (St. John's Gospel, 1891, page xxxvi) makes another relevant point when he writes—"By St. John's narrative only can we account for the conduct of Pilate, who, when the Lord avowed Himself the King of the Jews, instead of enquiring further into the matter, said to the chief priests and people 'I find no fault in this man' and would have released Him on the spot. From St. John we learn that he did enquire of Jesus the nature of His kingdom and found it to be a spiritual kingdom not of this world and so in no way likely to threaten the government of Caesar."

Gardner-Smith tries to bring out yet another point when he writes with regard to the scourging—"Once more we note that the Fourth Evangelist . . . is able to give a better historical account. The scourging was part of the examination of the prisoner and not a piece of wanton cruelty . . . It may be objected that Pilate would never have said "Take ye Him and crucify Him," for the Jews had no right to crucify." This requires some modification. Scourging was part of the normal punishment of a criminal condemned to death and, if it was so inflicted in Jesus' case, as the Synoptics would suggest, it would not have been looked upon as a piece of wanton cruelty. Moreover, it is far more likely, assuming that John is right in placing the scourging before the condemnation, that Pilate caused Jesus to be scourged in the hope that this would satisfy the Jews and so save Him from crucifixion than that scourging was part of the examination of the prisoner. When he said, "Take ye Him and crucify Him," Pilate may have been taunting the Jews, as he did later when he caused to be affixed to the Cross the inscription "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." Lagrange adds that in placing the Crowning with Thorns before the condemnation probability is with the Fourth Gospel.

According to the Fourth Gospel Jesus set out for the place of execution bearing His own cross, while, according to the Synoptics, the cross was carried by Simon of Cyrene. As has been remarked already, these two statements can be reconciled by assuming that Jesus at first bore His cross but, being physically unable to sustain the burden, was relieved of it by Simon of Cyrene. This was the view of Origen.

According to the Synoptics the disciples "all forsook Jesus and fled" (Mark XIV, 50), whereas the Fourth Gospel represents the beloved disciple as standing at the foot of the cross. There is no necessary conflict of evidence here, even if the beloved disciple was indeed one of the Twelve. He may well have recovered from his initial fright before the death and made his way to the cross to be with his Lord in the last dreadful hours. Bernard thinks that the Fourth Evangelist may have omitted the cry "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?", that awful cry that burned itself into the imagination of the early Church, because he wished to emphasise the voluntary nature of Christ's death. He points out that there are really three (and not two) traditions of the Passion in the Gospels—the Marcan, the Lucan (which incorporated information derived from Joanna, wife of Chuza, Herod's steward) and the Johannine. The witnesses report only what they have themselves observed and select from among the incidents they observed those which best serve their purpose in writing. Carpenter indeed can write, "Amid all the similarity of outward incident it (the Johannine story) might be the story of another being." Enough has surely been said to demonstrate the futility of this judgment.

Before we leave this part of our subject we must carefully con-

sider the apparent divergence between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel as regards the day and hour of the Crucifixion. The importance of this subject has been widely recognized, and it demands separate treatment. It is not that any important doctrine of the Christian religion depends upon whether Jesus died on the Passover Day, or on the day preceding the Passover, or whether He was crucified at the third hour (Mark XV, 25) or was still unsentenced at the sixth hour (John XIX, 14), but important doctrines of the Christian religion do depend in a large measure on the reliability of the Fourth Gospel, and, if it is in error on such a point, our belief in its general reliability may well be shaken. Schmiedel goes as far as to say on the other hand that "if John is right, this point is so decisive that we may seek the truth in this Gospel everywhere else as well" (Johannine Writings, page 119).

The Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel agree that Jesus was crucified on a Friday. Where they do not agree is whether this Friday was the Passover day (15 Nisan) or the day preceding the Passover (14 Nisan). According to Drummond 14 Nisan fell on a Friday in 30 A. D. and 15 Nisan possibly fell on a Friday in 34 A. D. Both these dates fell within the governorship of Pontius Pilate, but 30 A. D. is a much more probable date for the Crucifixion than 34 A. D., and accordingly, if Drummond's calculations are correct, this is evidence in favour of the Fourth Gospel. Further, Jackson understates the case when he concludes that I Corinthians V, 7—"For our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ"—MAY support the Johannine dating of the Crucifixion. Schmiedel too indulges in a curious inversion of the truth when he purports to find the clue to the dating of the Fourth Gospel in the Pauline passage. The balance of probability is in favour of the view that Paul used the words he did because Jesus had suffered on the day on which the Jews killed the paschal lamb, that is to say on the day before the Passover, and that the Fourth Gospel gives independent testimony to the fact. The main argument against the Synoptic dating is however drawn from the pages of the Synoptic Gospels. As Moffatt puts it, these Gospels are "inconsistent with themselves." According to Mark the chief priests and the scribes, when they sought how they might take Jesus by craft and put Him to death, said, "Not on the Feast day, lest there be an uproar of the people" (XIV, 2). Yet, having quoted this (from the point of view of the conspirators) reasonable conclusion, Mark in his succeeding narrative makes them take the very course against which they had decided, although he gives no hint of a change of plan on their part. Furthermore, Luke (XXII, 15-16) records the words of Jesus, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." These words are most naturally explained as implying that Jesus would have desired most strongly to eat the Passover with His dis-

ciples, had the will of the Father permitted, but, identifying Himself as ever with that will, knew as He spoke that His desire could not be satisfied, or in other words that He must die before the Passover. Again, the fact that arms were carried ("a great multitude with swords and staves from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders"—Mark XIV, 43) and work apparently going on ("They compel one Simon a Cyrenian who passed by, coming out of the country"—Mark XV, 21) do not lend support to the Synoptic representation that the day on which these things happened was the day of the Passover. As Lord Charnwood writes, "all likelihood is in favour of the story as told in the Fourth Gospel." In this connection it may perhaps be suggested that the sense intended in John XIII, 1 is best conveyed by the rendering "When Jesus knew that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father before the feast of the Passover . . ."

A further difference arises on the question how long Jesus hung on the Cross. The relevant texts are these—

Mark XV, 25—"And it was the third hour, and they crucified Him."

Mark XV, 33—"And when the sixth hour was come there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour."

Mark XV, 34—"And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice."

Mark XV, 37—"And gave up the ghost."

(Matthew follows Mark in the second, third and fourth of these passages, but not in the first. Luke follows Mark only in the second of these passages).

John XIX, 14—"And it was about the sixth hour and (Pilate) saith unto the Jews, Behold your king." (Note the inference that Jesus was not yet crucified at the sixth hour).

It will be seen that there is no necessary conflict between the notes of time in Matthew, Luke and John, if in John XIX, 14 "about the sixth hour" be read as meaning "approaching the sixth hour." It is however impossible to reconcile Mark XV, 25, which implies that Jesus hung on the Cross for six hours, with John XIX, 14, which allows for at most little more than three hours on the Cross. Did Jesus hang on the Cross for six hours or for three? In favour of the shorter period (from which Matthew and Luke do not dissent) may be cited the surprise felt at His early death. Moreover, the various hearings mentioned in the Gospels must have taken a considerable time, which militates against Mark's "third hour."

CHAPTER V.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE SYNOPTICS (Concluded). JESUS AND THE GENTILES. JEWISH OBJECTIONS TO JESUS. ALLEGED LITERARY DEPENDENCE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL ON THE SYNOPTICS. OMISSIONS FROM THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

One of the crucial questions—possibly the most crucial question—that the early Church had to face was the question of the terms on which Gentiles might be admitted. It was this which brought Paul into conflict with the Pillars at Jerusalem. On the subject of this conflict C. H. Watkins' book "St. Paul's Fight for Galatia" will be found especially useful.

Baur and the Tübingen school made the conflict the touchstone by means of which to separate the earlier from the later books of the New Testament. Those books which contain echoes of the conflict were regarded by them as early, while those which pass it over in silence were regarded as late. It was doubtless with this distinction in mind that Carpenter remarked of the Fourth Gospel—"The problem of the Gentiles is not presented as a *chose jugée*. It is absolutely ignored." Hence, presumably, we are to infer that, when the Fourth Gospel was written, the conflict had passed into such a remote past that it was beginning to be forgotten. What Baur and his school, and in our own day Carpenter, overlooked was that irrelevance to the subject in a book of the New Testament might just as well indicate that the book was written before the conflict as that it was written long after it had been settled. Moreover, if the view maintained in the present work is accepted, the Fourth Gospel is a faithful record of actual sayings and doings of Jesus, and movements and events subsequent to His Ascension would influence that record only insofar as they led the Evangelist to select certain sayings and events for inclusion in the Gospel and to omit others.

It is useless for Carpenter to write—"Had this (the admissibility of the Gentiles) been part of the primitive teaching it could not have been locked up in one single breast and only promulgated when the conflict was done." It is needless to argue against a conclusion based so obviously on wrong premises. As Bernard points out, "in fact there are many indications that both Matthew and Luke believed the Gentiles to be included within the redeeming purpose of Christ (and) Mark is the only Evangelist who knows nothing about the inclusion of the Gentiles." As evidence for Bernard's view we may cite Matthew VIII, 11—"And I say unto you that many shall come from the east and west and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven"—Matthew XII, 21—"And in His name shall the Gentiles trust"—Matthew XXI, 43—"The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof"—Luke II, 32—"A light to lighten the

Gentiles"—Luke XIV, 23—"Go out into the highways and heges and compel them to come in"—and Luke XX, 16—"He shall give the vineyard to others And, when they heard it, they said, God forbid". The Jews at any rate understood the significance of the Parable of the Vineyard. To these indications of the Divine Purpose may be added the obvious inference from Luke IV, 25-27, and from the Parable of the Prodigal Son in Luke XV.

It is true that in Matthew X, 5 we meet with the injunction, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles," but this was a specific instruction for a particular occasion. Again, Jesus' words in Matthew XV, 24—"I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel" mean no more than that His preaching mission was directed to the Jewish nation, and the task of evangelising the Gentile world was to be left to His followers.

The conclusion is clear that Jesus regarded His offer of salvation as open to the Gentiles and that the victory of Paul at a later date did not so much establish a new principle as vindicate a principle already present in the teaching of Jesus. It cannot be argued that, if Jesus in fact took this line, the attitude of the Jerusalem Church on the subject in the conflict with Paul becomes incomprehensible. There is abundance of evidence of Apostolic misunderstanding in the Gospels, and the full meaning of Jesus dawned but slowly on the Apostles' minds. As Burch comments on the conversation with the Samaritan woman, "His disciples' thoughts are with the Jews. They do not yet understand that His Gospel is for the world of men and women" (Structure, page 125). It need only be pointed out in conclusion that we are without information as to the part played by John in the conflict. He was a Pillar of the Jerusalem Church, but it was only Peter whom Paul rebuked.

Both in the Synoptics and in the Fourth Gospel we find Jesus confronted by what may be collectively described as "Jewish objections," and a comparison of these will show us what measure of agreement there is between the two representations. Both in the Synoptics and in the Fourth Gospel Jesus is—

(a) Asked for a sign (doubtless a miracle worked on demand as a demonstration of power)—Mark VIII, 11-12; John II, 18;

(b) Persecuted for breach of the Sabbath—Mark III, 6; John V, 16;

(c) Charged with blasphemy for claiming Godhead or the prerogatives of Godhead—Mark II, 7; John V, 18; X, 33.

(d) Reproached with His known earthly origin—Mark VI, 3; John VI, 42; though the objection can be reversed if need be—Mark IX, 29;

(e) Said to have a devil—Mark III, 22; John X, 20.

In other cases the charge recorded in one source is illustrated by the other, e. g.—

(f) The alleged threat to destroy the Temple (Mark XIV, 58) by John II, 19;

(g) The alleged illegitimate birth (John VIII, 41) by Luke 1, 26-38.

There is a close connection between—

(h) The fear of embroilment with the Romans (John XI, 48) and the charge of pretended royalty which would avert the danger (Luke XXIII, 2);

(i) Absence of authority (Mark XI, 28) and non-acceptance by the hierarchy (John VII, 48), which breathe the same order of ideas.

On the other hand—

(j) Association with the despised classes (Mark II, 16) and

(k) The breach of tradition (Mark VII, 5)

are charges peculiar to the Synoptic representation, though it was not to be expected that One who interpreted God's requirements with regard to Sabbath observance as Jesus did would pay undue respect to human tradition.

On the whole there is substantial agreement between the two representations with just that degree of difference which vouches for their independence.

There are of course many other points of difference between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, among them the omission from the latter of all reference to certain incidents which play a prominent part in the former, and this is a matter to which we shall recur later. Meanwhile enough has been said to justify the general conclusion that a comparison between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel discloses no adequate ground for impugning the trustworthiness of the Fourth Gospel. We have seen that in some cases apparently divergent accounts of a single incident refer in fact to different incidents, that in other cases it is possible to reconcile representations that at first sight appear flatly to contradict one another, and that in those other cases, such as the day and hour of the Crucifixion, where no reconciliation is possible, a very strong case can be made out for preferring the representation of the Fourth Gospel.

We have now to ask ourselves how the large measure of agreement which we have found in the Gospels is to be accounted for. The simplest explanation is that this agreement is due to the fact that the events to which reference is made really happened as they are recorded, and to many people this explanation will seem sufficient. Others will wish to carry the matter a little further. The author of the Fourth Gospel can hardly have been unaware of the representation of the life and death of Jesus that has been perpetuated by the Synoptists. It has however been no easy task to determine the exact nature of the relationship between their representation and his. Very many scholars have come to the conclusion that the Fourth Evangelist had the Synoptic Gospels before him as he wrote and that they are the main source of his information about the facts he records. If that is granted, we shall as the next step have to account

for his divergences from them, and this has been done in a number of ways.

Let us see what the critics have to say as to the alleged dependence of the Fourth Gospel on the Synoptics. Here are the views of three of the more radical among them. Bacon says, "There is dependence on Petrine story and to some extent on Matthean sayings." Schmiedel's view is that "the circumstances of many events are obscurely sketched in the Fourth Gospel" and he holds that one of the reasons for this is that sometimes "the author starts in a careless way from an account in the Synoptics" (Johannine Writings, page 81). In another place (page 51 of the same work) he writes, "It is almost universally agreed that the author of the Fourth Gospel had the other three before him when he wrote." H. P. Forbes was equally definite when writing (Johannine Literature, pages 154 and 155)—"The Johannine author had before him our Synoptics IN THEIR PRESENT FORM rather than the sources from which they were composed." He claims that scholars so widely divergent as Zahn and Holtzmann are agreed as to "the literary dependence of John upon the Synoptics" and goes on to describe the Fourth Evangelist as "a writer somewhat remote from the events who therefore endeavours to vivify his picture by a careful selection of material from the Synoptics, now excerpting from one, now from another, since he is uncertain which is the more original."

For detailed argument in support of this general view of the relationship between the Gospels we may cite two other critics, Drummond and Carpenter. The former writes, "In John III, 24 we read that John (the Baptist) had not yet been cast into prison, though the event had not been previously recorded. In John XI, 1 it is taken for granted that Mary and Martha are known . . . Not only is it assumed that they will be known to the reader, but it is not assumed that facts will be known which Luke has failed to record. Accordingly we are expressly told that 'there was a certain rich (sic) man Lazarus' and we also learn that the village which Luke leaves without a name was Bethany." Dealing with the Feeding of the Five Thousand Carpenter cites the Johannine author's mention of two hundred pennyworth of bread, the grass and the number 5000 as proof of his dependence on Mark. Similar points have been made by others with regard to other incidents, as for example the Cleansing of the Temple.

Some of the arguments advanced against this line of reasoning have indeed been woefully inadequate. That of Bretschneider in his *Probabilia* may be cited. He thinks that John was not in possession of our Synoptics, for otherwise he would have made use of some of the speeches contained in them and would not have contradicted them so often. If, however, we turn to the specific evidence of borrowing cited above, it does not seem very convincing. Drummond takes insufficient account of the vast mass of tradition which was part of the heritage of early Christianity and does not give weight to the possession

(which he admits) of personal knowledge on the part of the Fourth Evangelist. Why should it be assumed that the arrest of the Baptist and the existence of Mary and Martha could have been learned only from the pages of the Synoptics? Was the preaching of the first missionaries of the new faith wholly devoid of topical interest? It is curious that Drummond should misquote the Fourth Gospel by making it describe Lazarus of Bethany as a "rich" man. Carpenter in his turn attaches to the identity of terms in the accounts of the Feeding of the Five Thousand an importance that they do not possess for his argument. The two hundred pennyworth of bread, the grass and the number 5000 were far more probably mentioned because they represented the facts and were essential elements of the story. As regards the Cleansing of the Temple, Gardner-Smith well remarks that the story could hardly have been related at all without the use of the words "sellers", "tables", "money changers", and "doves".

More recent criticism shows a welcome change of attitude. While admitting that the author of the Fourth Gospel was familiar with the Synoptic material, Hoskyns regards it as "most improbable" that he had the three Synoptic Gospels before him when he composed his own Gospel. One need no longer be disturbed by the "almost universal recognition" of the fact of literary dependence, so confidently asserted by those who believe in it, with all the important consequences that flow from it. Alas for the radical critics! By a careful examination of the alleged parallels one by one Gardner-Smith has demolished the basis of the theory, and we are now able to face the problem of the Fourth Gospel untrammelled by its misleading influence.

In view of the extensive differences (though not, as we have seen, the extensive conflict) between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, it is not surprising to find that a great many things mentioned in the former are omitted altogether from the latter. What is really noteworthy is the nature of some of the events that are omitted. Among these are the Birth and Baptism of Jesus, the Temptation and the institution of the sacrament of Holy Communion.

As the story of the Fourth Gospel (apart from the Prologue) begins at a stage when Jesus was already a grown man, we should not expect to find more than incidental allusions to His miraculous birth, but even of such there is no certain instance. Burney indeed would read "Inasmuch as He was" instead of "which were" in John I, 13, making the verse read, "Inasmuch as He was born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of men, but of God." In Burney's view the Evangelist was bringing out the mystical import of the Virgin Birth for believers. The suggested emendation certainly makes good sense, but whether it expresses the idea in the mind of the Evangelist is another matter. What we must not do is to read into John VI, 42 a repudiation by the Evangelist of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. The question "Is not this Jesus, the son of

Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" certainly suggests an affirmative answer, but it is the affirmative answer of the Jews who are speaking and not of the Evangelist. Similarly the words of John VIII, 41—"We be not born of fornication"—may have been intended to cast a slur on Jesus, but there is no hint of its endorsement by the Evangelist. His part was faithfully to record things that happened and things that were said, and his picture would portray the truth very inexactly if he had omitted everything that men falsely suggested.

As regards the Baptism of Jesus, Goguel thinks that all mention of this was omitted from the Fourth Gospel so as not to subordinate Jesus to John, but in his view the incident of the dove is evidence that the Evangelist knew of it. It is of course incredible that either the Evangelist or his earliest readers did not know of it. If one of the objects of the publication of the Gospel was to controvert Cerinthus and his fellow Doketists, who held that Christ, a divine being, descended upon Jesus at the Baptism and left him before the Passion, the Evangelist may have been influenced by the fact to omit some events, however important in themselves, that did not fall within the plan of confutation.

The Temptation is so closely linked with the Baptism both by the Synoptists and in logical sequence that the omission of the Baptism would naturally conduce to that of the Temptation. Jackson's view that there is no room for the latter in the Johannine conception of Jesus is quite unacceptable. It was Jesus as pictured by the Synoptists, who applied to Himself the words, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord, thy God" (Luke IV, 12), and the Evangelist Luke saw in the Godhead of Jesus no bar to the Temptation. There is no real reason why the Fourth Evangelist should have done so.

Jackson refers to "the interesting conjecture that the absence from the Fourth Gospel of an account of the institution of the Lord's Supper may be attributed to an accident; originally there was such an account, but the leaf containing it dropped out" (*The Fourth Gospel and some recent German Criticism*). One is tempted to enquire whether the leaves containing the Evangelist's accounts of the Birth, Baptism and Temptation also dropped out. Of course it may well be that the draft of the Gospel did at one stage contain accounts of all these events, but, if so, the probability is that they were deliberately omitted on revision. As regards the institution of the sacrament of Holy Communion, Garvie may be right in suggesting that "there was no need of repeating an account which had become a part of the order of worship", but the Evangelist's main motive in writing was the promotion and stimulation of belief—"These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God . . ." (John XX, 31)—and (as we noticed just now with regard to the suggested desire to confute Cerinthus)

he would naturally omit events that did not in his opinion assist directly towards the attainment of his object.

A fact that must be considered in close connection with the omissions from the Fourth Gospel is that in that Gospel the organized Church does not once appear above the horizon, though the spiritual unity of believers is the idea dominating the discourse on the Vine. Had the Fourth Gospel been invented at the end of the first or beginning of the second century A. D. with current movements and discussions in the author's mind, it is incredible that the subject of the organized Church would not have loomed largely in its pages. The Evangelist does not put himself forward as a disputant in current controversy—he is content to record the truth as his Master proclaimed it and to leave to others the task of drawing the necessary inferences.

CHAPTER VI.

HISTORY OR ALLEGORY?

We have now reached the stage at which we may confidently see in the Fourth Gospel a work independent of the Synoptics, but not impugning the general acceptability of their story. Before we go further we must deal with another vital issue, the question whether the events recorded in the Fourth Gospel really happened as the Evangelist portrays them and the speeches put therein into the mouth of Jesus are His genuine utterances, or whether both events and speeches are largely fictitious, though intended to illustrate or give expression to ideas which the Evangelist believed to be essentially true. In other words we have to make up our minds whether in the Fourth Gospel we are confronted by history or allegory. As Lagrange puts the matter—"Christian tradition has given to John the title of 'the theologian' and much modern criticism has seen in the Gospel a theological exercise developed in the form of history" or in the words of Tillmann "*un livre didactique en forme d'Évangile.*"

Here are a few representative general pronouncements on this subject by critics most of whom belong to the radical school.

Goguel declares that "the Evangelist, careless of anachronism, often presupposes in the lifetime of Jesus the situation which existed only in the early Church." We shall have to go into a number of other questions before we can pronounce on the validity of this statement. It is certainly of the first importance for our present purpose to determine whether Goguel and those who think with him are right or wrong.

Carpenter regards the Fourth Gospel as "a work of imagination, the product of a mystic, not an historian." Referring specifically to the conversation with Nicodemus he follows Goguel in using the words "magnificently careless of historical anachronism."

Howard refers to the Fourth Evangelist as "unfettered by historic tradition" and attributes to him "a supreme indifference to material historicity." We may see reason for believing that in using the former phrase Howard spoke more truly than he knew, for an eye-witness would not be dependent on tradition.

Baur regarded the Fourth Gospel as "not in the proper sense history," and Scott held that it "does violence to historic fact" and "empties the life of Christ of much of its real worth and grandeur." In the opinion of Loisy the Evangelist "is not writing a history of Jesus but rather a treatise about the knowledge of Jesus," while Reville held that "he proposes to write a history but a history such as an Alexandrian understands it, which differs altogether from history as we understand it." Jackson charges the Evangelist with "a sovereign indifference" to the mere letter and regards the Gospel as "a distillation of the life and teaching of Jesus from the alembic of the Apostle's

own mind." Strachan detects "a strange apparent lack of interest in the historic setting." Even Sanday did not "honestly believe that everything happened exactly as it is or seems to be recorded." Drummond thinks that the writer ascribes to Jesus "words which he had heard in the Spirit rather than with his fleshly ears," and Schmiedel says, "He is not an author who is anxious to report nothing false; where it suits his purpose he reports it."

Here however the unanimity of the radical critics is broken, for B. W. Bacon says the exact opposite—"The idea that such a writer could deliberately prefer fiction to fact is most improbable . . . but real history was no longer attainable." So according to Bacon we still have misrepresentation, but no longer deliberate falsehood. With Bacon goes Macgregor, whose conclusion is that "generally speaking it is likely that he (the Evangelist) believed in his facts and recorded little that he did not suppose to be historical, even though his belief may not always have been justified." Rather curious expression is given to a somewhat similar view of the position by Bousset in his "Kyrios Christos" when he writes, "The leading idea he embraced—naturally not consciously but instinctively—was that of carrying back Myth and Dogma completely into History. Other critics with varying degrees of assurance admit the existence of an historical element in the Fourth Gospel. In the expression of what seems almost a doctrine of despair Hoskyns writes, "It is impossible for the critic to separate what is historical in the book from what is spiritual interpretation." We need not be too disturbed however by this conclusion. Perhaps we shall find ourselves able to dispense with the critics' services in this connection. With Hoskyns' division of the Gospel into the true and the false seem to agree P. V. Smith, who finds the Gospel designed to give a "SUBSTANTIALLY accurate account" and Garvie, who holds that "SUBSTANTIALLY the Gospel brings us into living touch with historical reality."

Others have taken a more decided line on the other side. Thus Renan says that in the Fourth Gospel the true teaching of Jesus was brought to light at the end of the first century. It is indeed a little difficult to believe that it can have remained hidden from men for nearly seventy years, as it must have done on this interpretation of the facts, and this aspect of the matter must receive consideration later. Renan however strikes a powerful blow for his cause when he puts this argument—"That anyone should write a long historical narrative with the afterthought of hiding symbolical subtleties in it which could only be discovered seventeen centuries later, that is something that is hardly conceivable." There is also weight in the judgment of Lagrange and Nolloth, of whom the former writes, "The Evangelist was lying if he wished us to believe in the historicity of facts which did not occur. He was needlessly equivocal if he was writing an allegory" and the latter, "If the writer of the Fourth Gospel had not the special opportunities of obtaining information that

he claims he was a deceiver, and his offence is heightened by the emphasis placed in the Gospel on truth."

On balance the view that it is most difficult to entertain is that of unconscious deception. Words can have no meaning if such passages as "These things said He in the synagogue as He taught in Capernaum" (John VI, 59) and "We know that His testimony is true" (John XXI, 24) do not constitute a conscious claim to historicity. Support also comes from Jewish scholarship for the historicity of the Fourth Gospel. Finally, on this side we may quote Burch, who says, "The writer of the Fourth Gospel is seen to be the recorder and not the creator of this Jesus Christ."

Now to whatever view of the matter our prejudices incline us there most certainly is a considerable volume of opinion unfavorable to the historicity of the Fourth Gospel, and, if we would form a fair judgment of its value, we must examine the evidence on which this opinion is founded.

Much of the symbolism which the radical critics purport to have discovered is fanciful in the extreme. Moreover, as Gardner (*The Ephesian Gospel*, page 60) points out, "we find that modern critics diverge considerably in their attempts to read as symbolic the details of time, of place and of number which are frequent in the Gospel." Evidently the symbolic meanings, if they are there, are exceedingly difficult to discover, and point is given to the wise words of Renan just quoted. Moreover, we must not get the idea that "symbolic" and "historical" are mutually exclusive opposites. A story may be at the same time symbolic and true to fact. In the not-so-remote past events and persons mentioned in the Old Testament were commonly explained as "types of the Redeemer." By using such language no one intended to imply that the events did not happen and the persons did not exist.

Now let us come to actual examples of alleged symbolism in the Fourth Gospel. Grill says of the first miracle at Cana of Galilee—"The created marriage-drink simply signifies the life-giving enjoyment which He will extend to believers when His hour, that is His death shall have come and with it His glorification" (*Untersuchungen uber die Entstehung des Vierten Evangeliums*, Erster Teil, page 6). Yet another of the radicals, Schmiedel, puts the matter thus—"The wine into which Jesus changed the water at Cana is of course the new, glowing and inspiring religion which Jesus put in the place of a weak Judaism"—so weak indeed, one is tempted to add, that it has survived until the present day in spite of bitter and persistent persecution. How fond Schmiedel is of those words "of course," as though everything were so delightfully clear. Can it be that he did feel a lingering doubt and was striving to reassure himself?

More than one critic has seen in the five husbands of the Samaritan woman (John IV, 18) an allusion to the gods of the five nations mentioned in II Kings XVII, 30 seq., and in him who was "not her

husband" Jehovah Himself. This is one of the big errors of the critics, for there are indeed five nations, but seven gods, mentioned in the passage referred to. It is moreover inconceivable that a paramour could have symbolized the Lord God of Hosts, so much so indeed that Holtzmann has substituted Simon Magus for Jehovah.

Then again, commenting on John IV, 28 Loisy expresses the view that the empty waterpot left at the well was typical of the fact that the woman had not yet received the Holy Spirit. This is interesting, but where did Loisy get his information that the waterpot was empty? To Carpenter the approaching crowd (John IV, 30) represents believers thronging into the Church. We shall deal later with the question of Sacramentalism in the Fourth Gospel, but here we may note the words of Burch—"To find baptismal symbolism in this incident means that the passage is to be dated later than Ignatius of Antioch, both as an effort in interpretation and as a dateable feature in institutional thought" (Structure, page 119).

To others the thirty-eight years for which the impotent man at the Pool of Bethesda had suffered from his infirmity (John V, 5) are symbolic of thirty-eight years during which the Children of Israel wandered in the Wilderness. It is true that a period of thirty-eight years is mentioned in Deuteronomy II, 14, but, if the incident had been fabricated with a symbolic aim, it would have been more natural to put the period at forty years as in Numbers XIV, 33 and other passages.

A further example of alleged symbolism is to be found in Bousset's description of the man born blind (John IX) as "that symbol of the community that had been born blind and regained its sight." In support of this view it has been suggested that the reference to exclusion from the synagogue in John IX, 22 is anachronistic. We need not doubt the similarity between the cases of the man born blind and the redeemed community, but we must be careful not to draw a wrong inference therefrom. As for the suggested anachronism, the burden of proof is on those who assert it.

Yet another instance of alleged symbolism, this time a very far-fetched one, is that of Loisy, when he says, with regard to Mary's anointing of Jesus' feet, that the house which was filled was the Church and the perfume used that of sanctity. Yet it is probably an understatement to say that the Church is not a conception which is very prominent in St. John's Gospel or Epistles.

The master effort of the school of thought that sees allegory permeating the Fourth Gospel through and through is to be found at page 247 of Carpenter's work on "The Johannine Writings," where, as if in illustration and justification of Gardner's remark quoted just now, a whole series of alternative interpretations of the number "153" in the story of the miraculous draught of fishes (John XXI) is served up for us to make our selection according to taste. There is that of Origen, who saw in 153 three times fifty plus three, the significance of the number 3 being that it stands for the Trinity; that of Jerome,

who—apparently quite wrongly—put the number of known species of fishes at 153 on what he conceived to be the authority of an ancient naturalist named Oppianus Cilix; that of Augustine, who found in 153 the potentiality of 17, that is to say the sum of the digits up to 17, that being the number arrived at by adding 10 (representing the Commandments) to 7 (for the Sevenfold Spirit); and that of Bishop Wordsworth, who arrived at the total 153 by adding the squares of 3 (for the Trinity) and 12 (for the Apostolate), though why the numbers should be squared does not appear. One wonders what number the Evangelist could have mentioned without exposing himself to symbolic interpretations of this sort. It is difficult to treat such criticism seriously. How much simpler and more probable it is to assume that the Evangelist tells us that the catch amounted to 153 great fishes, not with any allegorical intention, but simply because the fishes were counted and found to number 153.

If we think it worth while to examine this question of allegory in number a little more closely, we may make a comparison between the First and Fourth Gospels. On such a comparison the following facts emerge—

(a) All the numbers above 12 found in the First Gospel are round numbers;

(b) Despite the alleged tendency of the Fourth Evangelist to juggle with figures, numbers occur rather more frequently in the First than in the Fourth Gospel, much more frequently if the respective lengths of the two Gospels are taken into account; and

(c) The three unusual numbers 38, 46 and 153 occur only in the Fourth Gospel.

The most probable way of accounting for these facts seems to be to conclude that the Fourth Evangelist had a more exact knowledge of the events he records.

Even if we dismiss the theory of allegorical interpretation in the form in which the radical critics put it forward, we have still to meet the charge of unhistoricity levelled against the Fourth Gospel. According to Schmiedel (Johannine Writings, page 139) the historicity of the Fourth Gospel is discredited "at the outset" because—

(1) Jesus gives an explanation of the Supper a year before its celebration;

(2) Five hundred, if not a thousand, soldiers recoil and fall to the ground when He Whom they are sent to take prisoner says "I am He"; and

(3) So much as one hundred pounds of spices cannot have been used to embalm His body.

Before putting forward the first objection Schmiedel might have considered a little more carefully whether the Fourth Gospel, whatever his fellow critics may say, does contain any explanation of the Supper. As regards the second, it would not appear necessary to assume that the whole body of soldiers fell to the ground. In the darkness even

an eye-witness could not assure himself of anything quite so sweeping. It would be sufficient if those he saw fell to the ground, and this they may have done in mockery. As regards the third, we must be careful not to identify the surprising with the unhistorical, especially when we have before us such a surprising personality as Jesus. This holds good over a wider field than the third of Schmiedel's initial objections.

Of the view that the Fourth Gospel is an imaginary composition Lord Charnwood spoke with eloquent irony when he said—

"We are asked to believe that the association of . . . mediocre writers had the happy thought of composing what we may call 'faked' books (the 'fakes' referred to are the Fourth Gospel, the Johannine Epistles, Ephesians, the Pastoral Epistles, the Epistles of St. Peter and the speech to the Elders at Miletus in Acts XX) and that, when they did this, they invariably rose to a level above that of their times and in the majority of cases produced what ranks with the greatest literature of all time."

There is sound common-sense in this view. The Fourth Gospel speaks for itself. By some, however, the presence of alleged instances of carelessness or inconsistency in the Gospel is thought to lend support to the charge of unhistoricity. The argument is one of minor importance, but the matter may be worth examination.

It is pointed out that sometimes in the Fourth Gospel a discourse commences abruptly, that stories are left without what is regarded as a proper completion, and that there are apparent contradictions between different passages.

In some of these cases we shall find that the mode of representation in the Fourth Gospel is paralleled in the Synoptics, and, insofar as this is so, we may attribute what seems to us a peculiarity to the general literary method of the time.

In John XII, 44 we are told that Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on Me believeth not on Me but on Him that sent Me, but no preliminary indication is given of the circumstances that called forth His words. Precisely the same sort of abruptness is found in Luke VII, 31.

The favourite example of a supposedly unfinished story is that in John XII, 20 seq., where certain Greeks express the wish to see Jesus. But we are not told whether their request was granted. Here a parallel is to be found in Mark III, 31-35, where the mother and brethren of Jesus are apparently introduced only for the purpose of giving occasion for a saying of Jesus. In neither case would the Evangelist have agreed that the incident is incompletely reported. John was not further interested in the movements of the Greeks, nor Mark in what was done by Jesus' mother and brethren. The Evangelists' interest in their stories lay in the reaction on Jesus. Similar considerations apply to the case of John the Baptist, of whom Schmiedel says, "Once his retirement before Jesus has been described, the

Baptist is so unimportant to John that he does not think his arrest worth reporting" (Johannine Writings, page 56). This time we may agree with Schmiedel—the Fourth Evangelist was not writing a history of the times.

As regards apparent contradictions, Goguel calls attention to the fact that in the Fourth Gospel Jesus has more disciples than John (IV, 1), although no man receives His testimony (III, 32). This critic might have avoided the misunderstanding into which he has fallen had he read III, 33 as well. Immediately after the declaration that no man receiveth Jesus' testimony we are met by a reference to "him that hath received His testimony." Quite evidently no exact mathematical computation is intended. The comparison is between widespread unbelief and exceptional belief.

Again, Carpenter comments on John VIII, 43-47, "What has become then of the light that lighteth every man?" This critic fails to discern the distinction between the divine sonship available to every man that is born from above and the affiliation to the Devil that he may choose as an alternative.

A subject may generally be looked at from two or more points of view, and dissimilarity is not necessarily equivalent to contradiction. An example from the Synoptics may be found in Luke IX, 50 ("He that is not against us is for us") and Luke XI, 23 ("He that is not with Me is against Me"), the reconciling principle being that a cold neutrality is impossible in face of the claims of Jesus. A little consideration is sometimes as necessary in the case of the Synoptics as in that of the Fourth Gospel.

It is perhaps at this stage that we may most appropriately consider the one miracle of which we find an account in each of the four Gospels—the Feeding of the Five Thousand. Attention is more usually drawn to the agreement rather than to the differences between the Synoptic and Johannine accounts, and we are invited to accept the explanation that the latter was copied from the former. P. V. Smith points out, however, that in its account of the miracle the Fourth Gospel alone mentions Philip and Andrew and the fact that it was a lad who had the five loaves and two fishes; and Gardner-Smith's summing-up is that it may be claimed with some confidence that John's is a completely independent account.

The real interest of the critical examination of the account of the miracle and the argument on the following day in the Fourth Gospel lies in the remarkable exhibition of obtuseness on the part of certain critics for which it has given occasion. Thus we find Wendt (Gospel according to St. John) saying, "When on the day after the feeding of the multitude the people ask Him (Jesus) what He will do for a sign like Moses' miracle of the manna, we must have expected that he (the Evangelist) would make Jesus answer with a strong appeal to His actual signs, either to that of the miraculous feeding which His questioners had witnessed or (and so on)." Stanton

(The Gospels as Historical Documents, Vol. III) endorses this criticism in the following words—"It will readily be admitted that the words of John VI, 30—"What sign doest Thou?"—come strangely from those who had on the preceding day, according to the account in our Gospel, witnessed the feeding of the Five Thousand." On the same point we find Schmiedel remarking, "Jesus Himself referred to the feeding with bread simply as a figure of speech for the satisfaction of the soul by His teaching. The point of view in John does not, it is true, agree with this quite exactly, but much is gained already when we find him attaching no decisive value to the miracle as such" (Johannine Writings, page 105).

What weight is to be attached to all this? Is the discussion so improbable as to cast doubt on its historicity? Is it true that Jesus is represented as attaching no decisive value to the miracle as such? Let us look at the words of the Fourth Gospel. At John VI, 30 seq. we read, "They (the people) said therefore to Him (Jesus), what sign showest Thou then that we may see and believe Thee? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, He gave them bread from Heaven to eat. Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, Moses gave you not the bread from Heaven, for the Bread of God is He that cometh down from Heaven and giveth life unto the world."

Though Jesus no doubt attached no decisive value to any miracle as such, it is His hearers who challenge the adequacy of the Feeding of the Five Thousand as proof of His divine Sonship. What they say in effect is that Moses did as much when he brought down manna from Heaven and what they ask for is another and greater sign. Nothing could have been more futile than for Jesus to refer them to the very miracle that they had just rejected as insufficient. Instead He makes the perfectly logical reply that it was not Moses who gave the manna, but Jesus' own father, God, while God has given men a greater gift than manna in His Son, Jesus Christ. This argument is clear in itself and consistent with what we read elsewhere in the Gospel. It is precisely that reference to the Feeding of the Five Thousand which the critics think so appropriate that would have reduced the whole of this part of the discussion to nonsense.

NATIONALITY OF THE FOURTH EVANGELIST. WAS HE AN EYE-WITNESS? HIS ATTITUDE TO "THE JEWS."

We have so far arrived at the conclusion that the Fourth Gospel is a historical work not inconsistent with the Synoptics in its representation of the facts. We have now to take account of a fresh set of considerations throwing light on its authorship and the circumstances of its origin.

There is an almost complete consensus of opinion that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a Jew. "A Hebrew of the Hebrews, at home in Palestine" says Zahn. "By almost universal consent the Evangelist was himself a Jew" concurs Carpenter, who makes the further point that "the Evangelist's quotations point to a greater familiarity with the books of the Canon than it seems reasonable to ascribe to a Greek convert." In Howard's view "the more closely the Johannine writings are studied the more clearly does the Jewish character of both language and thought stand out". The verdict of Jewish scholarship swells the chorus.

Some of the radicals indicate a shade of doubt. "PROBABLY of Jewish origin" says Forbes, who hastens to add "but familiar with Greek in his early years" (Johannine Literature, page 169). "PERHAPS," admits Schmiedel, "he was of Jewish extraction" though "he cannot of course have received his wide culture in Palestine" (Johannine Writings, pages 190-1). How convenient it would be for the radical critics if they could find the author in a Greek of Asia Minor, but the evidence is too strong for them. Why the Evangelist cannot have received his wide culture in Palestine Schmiedel leaves unexplained. We are too apt to underestimate the extent to which foreign ideas had percolated into Palestine. It had been so in Old Testament times when the people constantly fell away into strange idolatries. How much more likely it was that there should be opportunities for the inflow of foreign ideas when the country had come under Roman domination.

It will have been noticed that Zahn refers to the author as "at home in Palestine." Howard concurs in this verdict when he declares that "the writer understood the topography, the manners and customs, the religious ideas and expectations of Palestine in our Lord's time." So does Scott Holland when he writes, "An old world of a very marked type, covering a very limited area, confined to a particular date, all revives before us as we read." Further support is given by Gaster, who in his work "The Samaritans, their History, Doctrines and Literature" declares that "the representation in John IV exactly corresponds to the features characteristic of the Samaritan traditions as known to us."

For details we cannot do better than refer to the Commentary of

Lagrange. Analysing the place names mentioned in the Gospels he finds 23 common to the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, 30 peculiar to the Synoptics (of which five occur only in Matthew, four only in Mark and seven only in Luke) and 24 peculiar to the Fourth Gospel. Of the Johannine place-names Lagrange says "No mistake has been found in any of them." The fish-pond with five porches has been discovered at Jerusalem. (It is not then a mere symbol of the five books of the Sacred Law). There is a deep well by Gerizim at a place called Askar. Cana is found in Kefr-Kenna. Ephraim was still known in the fourth century A. D. Solomon's Porch is known through Acts and Josephus. It is true that according to Carpenter Bethany beyond Jordan, Cana, Aenon, Salim and Ephraim cannot be found with any security on the map, but he admits that "there is no reason to doubt that they are real localities." As to Bethany Goguel asks the pertinent question whether in creating a fictitious locality the writer would have given it the name of a real place elsewhere. Kundsinn indeed holds that the places named in the Fourth Gospel are places of pilgrimage at the time the Gospel was composed. It is not clear how far this is intended to be regarded as general. To come to specific cases Eusebius vouches for pilgrimages to Bethany-Bethabara, but there is apparently no evidence for Aenon. It would be an unjustifiable assumption that the Johannine place-names are due to a writer who had no knowledge of them save as those of places of pilgrimage. The mention of Siloam, meaning Sent, seems to indicate local knowledge and, if there be any doubt about Ephraim, we must remember that in John XI, 54 Codex Bezae refers to THE PROVINCE of Ephraim and that Bauer places the city of that name about five miles N. E. of Bethel and in a wild region, which would accord very well with the requirements of the Johannine story.

Nolloth, who refers to "the writer's accuracy in the description of localities," also holds that "the Aramaisms of the Gospels tell of Palestine and of a time when the Church was almost wholly Jewish, and that this is especially true of the Fourth Gospel."

Turning from localities to persons or classes of persons, we find that about one-half of those mentioned in the Fourth Gospel occur also in the Gospel according to Mark. This proportion is consistent with the view that the Fourth Gospel is independent and historical. The number of persons or classes of persons mentioned in John but not in Mark is however only about one-half of the number of persons or classes of persons mentioned in Mark but not in John, notwithstanding that the Gospel according to Mark is much shorter. The Synoptic writer tries to form a mental picture of occurrences he did not himself behold and depicts Jesus as the dominating figure in those occurrences. To the Fourth Evangelist Jesus is more than this. As memory evokes the past (we are assuming in advance of our discussion of the point that he was an eye-witness), Jesus appears as the one person who really matters, and the other actors in the drama

tend to lose clearness of definition by reason of the very fierceness of the light that proceeds from Him. This feature of John's representation must not however be exaggerated. Nathanael, Nicodemus and the Woman of Samaria, for example, stand out on John's canvas as never-to-be-forgotten figures. Even the coming of the Greeks, which the Synoptists probably thought too trifling to record, receives its due mention from the one Evangelist who had perceived its spiritual significance. On the other hand the notice extended to those whom Jesus attracted is not bestowed on Jesus' adversaries. It is Jesus and not they that John wants us to know.

A few incidental examples of the knowledge of Palestinian conditions exhibited by the Fourth Evangelist should be mentioned in passing. In the story of the healing of the Officer's son (John IV, 46-53) the term used "BASILIKOS" is, as Howard points out, peculiarly appropriate, for Galilee was at the time under the rule of Herod Antipas. Then again in John XVIII, 17, the reference to "the damsel that kept the door" is true to local conditions. It was usual for the doorkeeper to be a woman (compare Acts XII, 13). On the other hand much play has been made of the expression "high priest that same year" (John XVIII, 13) as though it indicated a belief on the part of the Evangelist that the high priesthood was an annual office. The suggestion is hardly an example of critical impartiality for the meaning is plainly "high priest in that memorable year (of the Crucifixion)" and has no reference to the length of tenure of the office.

We have now to consider whether, on the evidence afforded by the Fourth Gospel itself, the author appears to have been an eye-witness of the events he describes. Forbes answers this question in the negative on the ground of the alleged literary dependence of the Gospel on the Synoptics. Forbes was unfortunate in that he had not the advantage of reading Gardner-Smith's convincing examination of this question. Schmiedel was with Forbes and for an equally fallacious reason. His words, "In no case . . . derived from actual observation of the events, for, if it were, we should read of it in the Synoptics as well," (Johannine Writings, page 111) are a model of logical inconsequence. The specific question is asked by Jackson how the Evangelist obtained information of the conversations, etc., recorded in John III (Nicodemus), IV, 7-26 (Samaritan woman), XI, 47 seq. (deliberations of the Council), XIX (conversations with Pilate), XIX, 38 seq. (re the burial of Jesus' body) and XX, 11 seq. (Mary at the sepulchre). The answer is however so clear in most cases that the mere putting of such questions argues a lack of critical acumen on the part of him who puts them. There is nothing in the account of the conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus to suggest that these two were necessarily alone at the time (see Sadler, Gospel, page vi). The Evangelist may himself have been present, especially if he was one of the inner circle of disciples. Even if Jesus and Nicodemus were alone, and P. V. Smith is right in identifying the latter with the

famous anti-Zealot Nikdemon ben Gorion, who never actually became a Christian, it is clear that he was sufficiently friendly disposed (John VII, 50-52 and XIX, 39) to have been himself a likely source of information. As for the conversation with the Samaritan woman, she so obviously broadcast her story of it (John IV 28-29 and 39) that it seems quite superfluous to look further for an informant. As to the deliberations of the Council, either Joseph of Arimathaea or Nicodemus was a likely informant. The same holds good of the burial of Jesus' body. Were there no listening ears at the conversation between Jesus and Pilate? And what possible ground is there for suggesting that Mary kept silence about her experiences at the Sepulchre? Indeed, we are expressly told that she did not (John XX, 18). The source of the absurdity that underlies the putting of such questions is that the questioner cannot divest his mind of the idea that the Evangelist was not a contemporary of Jesus. When we rid our minds of this idea, the difficulties melt away. So long as it is retained, they may well seem insuperable.

A more serious point is raised by Garvie, when he remarks, "Surely the sacred intimacies of Father and Son were not for profane ears to hear." One might well have so expected, but evidently one would have been wrong. The prayers of Jesus were directed man-ward as well as God-ward, as is evidenced by John XI, 41-42—"Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast heard Me. And I knew that Thou hearest Me always; but BECAUSE OF THE PEOPLE THAT STAND BY I SAID IT . . ." It was no desire of Jesus that His most personal petitions should lack human hearers.

There is great force in Garvie's general conclusion that "it seems incredible that one who was not an eye-witness and had no concern for historical reality should so carefully have distinguished the varied and varying attitudes assumed towards Jesus and have presented them with so striking verisimilitude."

A few incidental indications affording further support to the view that the Evangelist was an eye-witness may be cited. We have already noted the tone of surprise ringing out in the words, "And he confessed and denied not, but confessed . . ." (John I, 20). The moment had evidently been one never to be forgotten by those who were present. Then Archbishop Bernard has pointed out that, as treasurer of the little company, Judas might very likely enjoy some sort of precedence and, if so, would naturally occupy a place at the table next to Jesus at the Supper. This would account for the indication of Judas as the prospective traitor escaping general notice. That it did escape general notice is evident from the inaction of Peter. Had he been aware of it, he would certainly have made an attempt to prevent Judas from leaving the room alive. The representation of the Fourth Gospel on this point satisfies all the demands of probability. That Gospel is unique in mentioning the exit of Judas (which would naturally have made a deep impression on John) and in naming the high

priest's servant whom Peter struck, this latter yet another mark of an eye-witness.

Now in face of the evidence that the Evangelist was himself a Palestinian Jew by origin, how are we to account for his persistent hostility to those whom he describes as "the Jews" and who were on this showing his own compatriots? First of all we must satisfy ourselves able to rule out some of the passages cited by those who stress it, on the ground that they are not relevant. "He came unto His own and His own received Him not" is the rendering in the English Authorized Version of John I, 11, and Calmes states a widely-accepted opinion of this passage when he declares that "the expressions 'to His own' and 'His own' refer to the JEWISH NATION." The same view is expressed a little more forcibly by Strachan, who asserts that "in none of the Gospels is it set forward so tragically as in the Fourth that the chosen nation rejected Jesus" and goes on to quote John I, 11 as though this were the declaration at the very outset of the Gospel of an anti-Judaic principle that was to govern it. All this is fundamentally wrong, as Forbes perceived when he wrote, "HIS OWN are not here the patriarchs, nor the Jews as race, who reject Him, but the mass of humanity" (Johnannine Literature, page 182). The translation in the Authorized Version obscures a distinction that is clear in the Greek. There the first "His own" in John I, 11 is in the neuter plural and means literally "the things that were His own" because they were His creation (see John I, 10—"The world was made by Him"), while the second "His own" is the masculine plural and means "they that were His own" because they were a part of His creation. It is upon mankind as a whole, and not upon the Jews in particular, that the guilt of His rejection is cast. At first sight this would appear to be contradicted by the succeeding words, "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God (i. e. He enabled them to become sons AS OF RIGHT—compare Revelation XXII, 14 "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that THEY MAY HAVE RIGHT to the tree of life"). The words "His own," while referring to mankind as a body, do not exclude the existence of a minority who did not reject Him. A similar turn of speech is to be found in John III, 32-33, where the statement that "no man receiveth His testimony" is followed by the words, "He that hath received His testimony hath set to his seal that God is true." In any event we should have had to resort to the same process of explanation if the Jews had been intended, for not all the Jews rejected Jesus.

To others the idea of scornful repudiation is implied by the words "YOUR LAW" in John X, 34—"Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are Gods?" The word YOUR before Law does not signify that this Law was not recognized by Jesus. One need not read far in the Fourth Gospel to satisfy oneself of the baselessness of such a view. The words "YOUR Law" mean "the Law

that YOU recognize," and that can therefore be cited in argument against you, and have no reference to Jesus' own attitude to that law.

Burch indeed understands the whole teaching of Jesus to be anti-Judaistic and says that "for Jesus Christ the Devil is the embodiment of Jewish ideas and practices" (Structure, page 90). Burch however has not here spoken with the meticulous care that marks most of his utterances. Further, we need not attach importance in this connection to the words of Wright, who holds that "when the author wrote an acute polemical situation existed between Christians and Jews," for we shall find reason for disagreeing with this scholar as to the date and circumstances of composition of the Fourth Gospel. Lagrange, as so often, expresses a more probable view when he opines that "it certainly seems that John has invented a special shade of meaning for the word IOUDAIOTI so as not to repeat 'the chief priests and the Pharisees.' It is quite natural that it should have been inspired in him by the attitude taken up by the leaders of the nation toward Jesus." As he points out, Israel remains the name of the people chosen by God—"Behold an Israelite indeed" (John I, 47) is high praise.

We may also notice the views of Hoskyns, who says, "Throughout his Gospel the Fourth Evangelist uses the phrase 'the Jews' to denote the national rejection of the Christ and especially His rejection by the Jewish authorities" and of Howard, whose conclusion on this point is that "the Fourth Evangelist . . . could not forget that his people had rejected the Messiah and he had found such complete satisfaction in the life of communion with the Lord Jesus that the Synagogue no longer made any appeal to him."

Our conclusion must be that the Fourth Evangelist has no antipathy to the Jews as such, but that he cannot forget the rejection of his Master by official Judaism.

CHAPTER VIII

LITERARY STYLE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL. IS IT THE WORK OF ONE OR SEVERAL HANDS? ITS RELATION TO GREEK THOUGHT.

Can the literary style of the Fourth Gospel throw any light on its authorship and the circumstances of its origin?

The oldest manuscripts of the Fourth Gospel (as is the case with the whole of the New Testament) exhibit it as a work written in Greek, and it has until quite recently been generally assumed that the Greek text is the original. In our time, however, Schlatter and Burney have suggested that the Greek text is the translation of an Aramaic prototype. The languages of the Holy Land in the days of Jesus were Hebrew (Aramaic), Greek and Latin (John XIX, 20), but, though Jesus probably spoke in all three, just as a modern Swiss may be familiar with French, German and Italian, He would be more likely to use Aramaic in His ordinary conversations. Schlatter says that "the Greek of the Gospel is that of one who has first thought out his meaning in Aramaic and, although master of the Greek equivalent, forms his sentences on the example of the Aramaic." This would be explicable if the Evangelist took down the words of Jesus in their original tongue as they were uttered or soon afterwards. For a complete statement of the case for holding that the Fourth Gospel as we have it is the Greek translation of an Aramaic original the reader is referred to Schlatter's "*Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten*", to Burney's "*Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*" and to Torrey's article in the *Harvard Theological Review* for October, 1923. The argument rests on the alleged Aramaic character of the idiom, such for example as the juxtaposition of subject and attribute without a verbal link. Less weight attaches in this connection to the frequent parallelism of the Fourth Gospel (as for instance in "Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again, but he that drinketh of the water that I will give him shall never thirst"—John IV, 13-14), for this is evidence of a habit of mind which a person used to it would carry with him when writing in any language. It becomes valuable evidence however when we come to consider further how far the Fourth Gospel reproduces the actual teaching of Jesus.

An important point to which to direct attention at this stage is the poverty of the vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel as compared with that of the Synoptics, a poverty linked however with an absence of grammatical errors. This poverty of vocabulary is a feature noticeable in the effort of almost anyone translating from his own native tongue into a language with which he is less familiar. Another notable point is stressed by Howard when he writes, "One of the most striking features of the syntax of the Johannine writings is the extraordinarily free use of the particle 'INA with the subjunctive WHERE THE IDEA OF PURPOSE IS NOT EVEN LATENT.'" This will be very relevant

when we come to discuss the teaching of the Fourth Gospel on the subject of predestination.

It is true that the theory that the Gospel as a whole is the translation into Greek of an Aramaic original has not met with the general acceptance of scholars. Lagrange, for example, says, "The Greek text of John exhibits itself as more original and more expressive than it would be if one corrected it on the basis of an assumed Aramaic prototype." At the very least however we may follow Nolloth when he claims that "the Master's words came back to the Evangelist in their Aramaic form." We may find reason too for the further conclusion that the style of Jesus had burnt itself into the mind of the Evangelist and moulded his own style as has the language of the Authorized Version of the Bible the style of very many English writers. This would account for the fact that it is occasionally difficult to determine where the words of Jesus end and the comments of the Evangelist begin. A good example of this is found in John III, where the provenance of verses 13-21 and 31-36 is variously assigned to Jesus or to the Evangelist. Lagrange assigns them—with the exception of verses 13-15—to the Evangelist on the ground that they presuppose a situation in which the Jews had already rejected Jesus which he—in contrast to Scott Holland—does not believe had been reached at that stage. Calmes, Belser and Tillmann are with Lagrange; Schanz, Zahn, Bauer and Loisy are against him. Jackson accounts for the existence of the difficulty by arguing that the Evangelist makes his characters speak in his own language and says that his own individuality is impressed on all his reports of the sayings and discourses of Jesus. This is a widely-held view among the critics, but it seems to lack solid basis. How much more probable it is that the Evangelist speaks in the style, or rather one of the styles, of Jesus. We should see in Jesus the all-pervading element in the picture.

It is the inspiration of Jesus that gives its appearance of unity to the Gospel, itself described by Strauss as "the seamless tunic." We must now enquire whether this unity is real or only apparent, as upon our answer to this question will depend whether we attribute its composition to one person or to several persons. Several passages will come under consideration as possible interpolations, and against one of these, the story of the woman taken in adultery (John VII, 53—VIII, 11), the evidence is overwhelming. It is not found in any of the early Greek uncials except Codex Bezae; the uniformity of style marking the Gospel as a whole does not extend to it; and the text is less assured, variant readings being much more frequent than in any other part of the Gospel. P. V. Smith thinks the story possibly a marginal note on John VIII, 15—"I judge no man"—which has somehow crept into the text, and Hoskyns regards it as embodying a genuine tradition and that a Johannine tradition.

Besides this there is only one considerable section of the Gospel

that has been seriously challenged on the ground that it is an addition, and that is the last chapter, John XXI. Here the position is in several respects the exact opposite of that which we found in the case of the story of the adulterous woman. No copy of the Gospel, so far as we know, was ever issued without including the twenty-first chapter. Bernard finds remarkable agreements in style between chapters I-XX on the one hand and chapter XXI on the other; and Howard, to his own surprise, has been led by the study of linguistic features to change his former view that chapter XXI came from another hand. It has indeed often been suggested that the source of this chapter was the lost ending of Mark's Gospel, but Stanton thinks this suggestion "very precarious" and Gardner-Smith contends that the names of the seven disciples in chapter XXI were "never derived from a Synoptic source." The chapter does however present difficulties, and they should be faced. In John XXI, 6 the disciples, seven in number, are not able to drag the net for the multitude of fishes, but in John XXI, 8 the same disciples without Peter drag the net full of fishes, while in John XXI, 11 Peter alone draws the net to land. The solution of the difficulty presented by the apparent inconsistency of these passages is that they show a progressive increase of power, the power that Jesus gives. Another apparent difficulty is that in John XXI, 9 the disciples see a fire and fish laid thereon, but nevertheless in John XXI, 10 Jesus says, "Bring of the fish which ye have now taken." The answer seems to be that the fish in the former case represents Jesus' own repast and that in the latter case the disciples' repast. The incident shows Jesus as independent of human exertions. Then again Peter's action appears strange when he girds his coat about him before casting himself into the sea, but people do strange things when acting under the influence of strong emotions. It was probably the very strangeness of Peter's action that impressed itself upon the Evangelist's mind, and this detail is an indication of historicity. We see therefore that there is no justification for the verdict of Hoskyns that "the narrative is bent this way and that under the subtle influence of the symbolism" and that "a correct interpretation depends upon a correct understanding of the significance of the number 153." If it did, we might well regard the case as hopeless. Julicher insists that chapter XXI is an integral part of the Gospel; and Bernard thinks that it was added as a postscript because it was considered important that the rehabilitation of Peter should be placed on record. Garvie, while accepting the view that the chapter is a postscript, thinks it quite impossible that it was the work of the Evangelist and suggests that "the author of such an addition would make it his business to copy the style as nearly as possible." So there crops up again the old theory of the faking of the Word of God, coupled with an interpretation of the matter of style which is indeed just possible but highly improbable.

A further series of short passages is singled out by Bernard as non-

Johannine glosses. These are John IV, 1-2; V, 4; VI, 23; XI, 2; and XII, 16. He thinks it likely that they were added after the Gospel was finished but perhaps before it was issued to the Church, but he is not prepared to rule out entirely the possibility of some at any rate of these additions having been made by the Evangelist.

These matters touch only the fringe of the Gospel. Some critics, among them Wellhausen, Schwartz, Loisy, Soltan, Spitta, Briggs and Wendt, make much more drastic suggestions. Briggs and Wendt assign "works" to an earlier writer and "signs" to a later. Like Wendt Soltan holds that the discourses in the Fourth Gospel existed as a separate collection before the remainder of the Gospel was compiled. This is a valuable suggestion, always assuming that the possibility that the collection of the discourses was the work of the Evangelist is not ruled out. It is consistent with the view of Windisch that the Gospel as a whole must be regarded as the work of a single author but contains that author's own additions.

Comparing Spitta's proposed division of the Gospel with Wendt's, Howard makes a comment that is of much wider application. He says, "Both Spitta and Wendt divide the Gospel into two portions . . . but the results are so dissimilar that they cannot both be right. Is it not probable that they are both wrong? Every fresh attempt to show by what different hands the various parts of the Gospel were written adds to the inherent improbability that any solution will be found along these lines. It is evident that, if the Gospel is a composite work, the validity of these various criteria will be shown by the convergence of their evidence towards one definite result. This is certainly not the case". Garvie adds force to this argument when he asks "If there had been an earlier form of the Gospel, would not some traces of it have remained?"

"One and the same man wrote the entire book; not uninterruptedly but as he brought himself repeatedly to his task," says W. Bauer. "The literary creation of a single author, including the last chapter" says Gardner. For the time being we may leave the matter there.

We now come to one of the most fundamental of the issues raised in connection with the Fourth Gospel, the relation of the Gospel to Greek thought. As Lagrange puts the matter, the source of the theology of the Fourth Gospel has been sought by many critics, firstly in the Alexandrian philosopher Philo and then in Hellenic paganism. According to these critics the Evangelist had in view controversies between Hellenized and Judaizing Christians and sought to give the authority of the Master to his own affirmations. Carpenter is among those who have developed this point of view, remarking that "over against the Judaeo-Christian communities beyond the Jordan, heirs of the Church at Jerusalem, cherishing a human Messiah who attained his dignity by perfect obedience and the complete fulfilment of the Law, stood the Hellenic world with philosophical speculations and ideals of its own." Speaking of Philo, the Jew of Alexandria, who was from

twenty to thirty years older than Jesus, Reville says, "Philo knew neither Jesus nor the Gospel, but assuredly of all the prophets of the Old Covenant there is not a single one who was to a higher degree the precursor of the Christ preached by the first missionaries of Christianity." According to Scott the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel is a "succinct statement of the Philonic doctrine of the Logos," and he regards that doctrine as "an attempt to escape from the belief in a divine creator". According to Schmiedel Heracleitus (c. 500-450 B. C.) introduced the term "Logos" into Greek philosophy in the sense of "the reasonable order which rules in the world", the Stoics adopted the word and the idea (from 300 B. C.), and we find the doctrine fully developed in Philo. The same writer refers to "the mingling of the religions of the Babylonians, Persians, Egyptians, Syrians, peoples of Asia Minor and Greeks in the last centuries before Christ" (Johannine Writings, pages 142 and 147). Forbes (Johannine Literature, pages 160) points out that a number of the terms used in the Prologue, ARCHE, LOGOS, ZOE, PHOS, SKOTIA, PLEROMA and MONOGENES, are among the widely-used names of Gnostic aeons or potencies, that the verb GIGNOSKO is used 25 times in the Fourth Gospel, and that the chief element of eternal life is declared in John XVII, 3 to be knowledge.

Bousset analyses the components that went to make up the philosophy of Philo as the Old Testament, Greek philosophy and Oriental mysticism. In his view the characteristics of the third are the contrast between a narrow circle and the world, dualism, ecstasy, supernaturalism and mystic rites; and a piety born in this sphere early amalgamated with the true Gospel of Jesus. In the words of this critic, "The decisive line of division for Christianity lies precisely at its passage from Palestinian to Hellenistic ground." Grill, writing in the same strain, refers to the thorough-going Hellenizing typology of the Fourth Gospel and cites as Dionysiac and allied traits in its picture of Christ the following—Joybringer to mankind; Poured-out of the water of life and personified Vine; Miracle-performing wedding guest, who is himself also bridegroom; Zealot, who also appears as maniac; Threatened with stoning; Seer, physician, liberator, purifier, saviour, shepherd; Raiser of the dead; One who suffers death himself; Conqueror over death; Disappearing and reappearing; Dwelling in his own, enabling his own to perform the works which he performs. Grill suggests a connection between Martha and the Vedic Armati and compares the Lord's Prayer with Parsee efforts (Untersuchungen, Part II). Sir J. G. Frazer in "The Golden Bough" goes even further back when he declares that "most of the elements of Christianity are derived from worship of the spirit of vegetation, the religion invented in the infancy of agriculture to insure the fertility of the soil".

There is happily another side to all this. Bishop Gore gives a timely warning against the assumption that the use of the same terms

by different people is always intended to convey the same ideas (The Holy Spirit and the Church, page 103). As Burney points out, Philo's doctrine was in no sense the moulding influence of the thought of the Fourth Gospel. Jesus often seized current ideas and gave them a new content. In contrast to the Fourth Gospel Philo says clearly that the Logos is not God. Schmiedel adds that the idea that the Logos could become flesh would have been to Philo something impossible. Hoskyns expressed a great truth when he wrote—"The critic may range the Fourth Gospel with Philo and the Alexandrian philosophers, but . . . did the poor and ignorant, when they lay a-dying, ever ask their Rabbis to read to them out of the voluminous writings of Philo and of those like him?"

The key to this aspect of the Johannine problem is to be found in the recognition that Palestinian thought IN THE TIME OF JESUS must have been profoundly affected by the mingling of religions. A multitude of factors go to make up the representation of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, but the most obvious explanation to those who will see is that the work of selection and presentation was that of Jesus Himself. As McClymont observes, "residence in Galilee" involved "contact with Greek civilization" (St. John in Century Bible); and Sanday says, "I believe it to be possible that a doctrine like that of the Logos was more widely diffused than we suppose". Sanders, when he writes, "It may well be that others besides the author of the Fourth Gospel made the same adaptation that he did of the term Logos to the expression of Christian truth", and Lord Charnwood, when he expresses the belief that the alleged theological development in the New Testament is a development of germs present in the teaching and life of Jesus and is not a result of Hellenization, have seen part of the truth but only part. They detract unduly from the completeness of Jesus. Our Lord may not have made a special study of philosophy, but the idea of the Logos had long been a commonplace and the adoption of it no more proves a philosophical education than the use of the word "evolution" would do so at the present day (On this point see Drummond). Nor would it appear that Dodd is anywhere nearer the truth when he declares that the NEW and ORIGINAL contribution of the Fourth Gospel is its announcement that the revelation of Godhead is to be sought in the words and deeds of a Person who taught in Palestine and was crucified under Pontius Pilate. This must have been patently clear to many who saw the historical Jesus in the days of His flesh and believed on Him.

Forbes is right in saying that in John XVII 3 the chief element of eternal life is declared to be knowledge, but this knowledge is not a knowledge limited to the learned few—on the contrary it is a knowledge that even the unlearned can attain. Moreover language reminiscent of the mysteries is not confined to the Fourth Gospel. It is found also in what the critics regard as the most primitive of the Gospels. In Mark IV, 11, for example, we read, "Unto you is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God" and in

Mark VII, 18, "Are ye so without understanding also?" We must not however draw a wrong inference from its presence there.

Bishop Gore well sums up the case when he says, "The mysteries played no part in the origin of Christianity, (but) the prevalence of the mysteries in the Roman Empire will certainly be regarded as part of the divine preparation for the spread of a universal Gospel (Holy Spirit and the Church, pages 104 and 105). Gore enumerates as essential differences between Christianity and the mysteries (1) the Christian belief in one God; (2) the fact that Christianity drew from the common stock of human religions through Judaism; (3) the further fact that Christianity superimposed the new upon the old and let the new Christian ideas banish the old vices and superstitions.

Much scholarly work has been done with a view to the elucidation of Greek thought at the end of the first century A. D., and the pity is that the bearing on the Johannine problem of the conclusions arrived at has not been correctly apprehended. We shall presently discover reason for thinking that conditions at the time of the Gospel's compilation may have helped to determine the evangelist's choice among the materials available to him. That they helped to shape those materials we do not for a moment believe.

CHAPTER IX.

RELATION BETWEEN THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND PAUL. DATE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

From our discussion of the influence of Greek thought on the Fourth Gospel we turn naturally to the question of the relationship between the teaching of Paul and the Fourth Gospel.

The radical critics distinguish carefully between the teaching of Paul and that of Jesus, from which according to them it was a development and to which it added new ideas; and they regard the Fourth Gospel as based fundamentally on Paulinism but marking a further stage in the process of development away from the historic Jesus.

Firstly as to Paulinism, Bousset says that Paul's teaching is "not that of Jesus", and Scott finds it "difficult to recognize the features of the historical Jesus in the glorified Being who has manifested Himself to Paul". Bousset can speak of Pauline-Johannine Christianity and attribute to it the qualities of dualism and pessimism, while Gardner holds that Paul and the Fourth Evangelist have in the main the same conception of Christianity and are both inspired by the same ideas (Ephesian Gospel, page 78). B. W. Bacon says that the Johannine writings are "characterized by a broad universalism and reproduce the mysticism of Paul" (Making of the New Testament, page 212). but to Scott, although the Fourth Gospel is built on foundations that had already been laid by Paul, its theology is a development along peculiar lines of Paulinism, and Carpenter contends that the author of the Fourth Gospel "completed the work begun by the Apostle Paul, the impassioned champion of Christian liberty for the Gentile world, who did not live to see its full assimilation to Greek thought."

Between them Scott and Carpenter enumerate the following differences between Paulinism and the Fourth Gospel—

- (1) "John" does not start like Paul with facts of personal experience but with a priori assumptions;
- (2) Paul dwells on the death as illuminating the inner purpose of Jesus' life, while "John" reverts to the life and finds that it anticipated in every detail the crowning revelation;
- (3) "John" endeavoured to combine with his own thought, which was complete in itself, the doctrine of the Spirit as set forth by Paul;
- (4) Loyal obedience to another's commands is in marked contrast with the Pauline "Life in Spirit".
- (5) The Apostle Paul proclaims a Gospel of Reconciliation, the Fourth Gospel expounds a Gospel of Revelation.

It is all a question of degree, a little more originality to Paul and a little less to the Fourth Evangelist, or vice versa. The one thing that these critics will not admit is that the religion of the Fourth Evangelist and the religion of Paul are also the religion of Jesus. In

the words of Hoskyns, "Were we to accept that St. John formed his conception of Christianity . . . from Jesus' teaching, we should have to refuse St. Paul all originality, for we should leave him scarcely an independent thought". This is the crux of the whole matter, and it settles the question at issue in a way that Hoskyns did not perceive. As Lord Charnwood has well remarked, "Paul himself shows no conception that he is preaching anything save the very faith of the original Christians which once he had persecuted". Independent thought, indeed! Where did Paul claim any? On the contrary he glorified in his very dependence. He had his own methods of presentation, methods specially adapted to the requirements of the field in which he had to labour, but the message he presented was, on his own showing, nay rather on his own exulting claim, the message of Jesus and not that of Paul. Bousset himself admits that Paul "did not introduce new ideas into Christianity but adopted and expounded the ideas he found at Antioch, Damascus and elsewhere," and Sanday claims that "it is out of this common ground (of fundamental beliefs), and not out of the special features of the Pauline theology, that the teaching of the Fourth Gospel really sprang". Only one more step is necessary. We must look behind the fundamental beliefs of early Christianity to Him who was their source. We found reason to assert the historicity of the events recorded in the Fourth Gospel—why deny the historicity of the teaching attributed in that Gospel to Jesus?

A great deal of argument has taken place as to the date and place of origin of the Fourth Gospel. As to the former we should note that the date or dates of composition may not even approximate to the date of publication and, if we conclude that this was the case, we may find that the place of composition and the place of publication do not coincide. These possibilities have too often been overlooked by the critics, and accordingly we find a certain looseness of language on the subject.

Generally speaking the radical critics have put the date of composition and publication of the Fourth Gospel much later than the more conservative critics; and there has been a tendency of late years to place the Gospel a great deal earlier than had at one time been widely believed.

Baur and the Tübingen School put "John" at about 170 A. D. In this they were influenced by the alleged traces of Gnosticism, but the guiding principle of Baur, the most radical of the radicals, has been well stated by Lord Charnwood in his "According to St. John" as follows:—"The key to the understanding of the New Testament lay for Baur in the conflict between St. Paul, endeavouring to base a new world-religion on the personality of Jesus Christ, and St. Peter and the rest, good Jews to whom Jesus Christ was just the Jewish Messiah. All those books of the New Testament in which the full acuteness of the conflict could not be seen must, he inferred, be the products of

a later time in which reconciliation had set in and men were inclined to pretend that there had never been conflict at all".

Ignoring for the time being the faulty diagnosis of the position of Peter and those who sympathized with him, we should note once more than Baur overlooked an obvious alternative, to wit, that some at least of the books of the New Testament "in which the full acuteness of the conflict could not be seen", and in particular the Fourth Gospel, might have been written before the conflict had developed. This is a possibility that must be borne in mind, though the discovery of Rylands Papyrus 457, a fragment of the Gospel containing parts of verses 31-33 and 37-38 of chapter XVIII and placed by experts on palaeographical grounds about 150 A. D., or if anything even earlier, has put Baur's date of 170 A. D. quite out of the bounds of possibility and seriously jeopardized the chances that Schmiedel, who put the Gospel "very shortly before 140 A. D." (Johannine Writings, page 200), Loisy, who inclines in his *"La Naissance du Christianisme"* to about 135-140 A. D. as the date of the first redaction of the Gospel, and O. Pfleiderer, who would place its first draft about 135 A. D., are anywhere near the truth. Forbes, who puts the date of composition between 100 and 140 A. D. and adds that "all attempts at a more precise determination of the date lack cogency"; B. W. Bacon, whose date is about 105-110 A. D. "with the general consent both of ancient tradition and modern criticism"—bold words these (*Making of the New Testament*, page 212); and Carpenter, with a verdict of "a little before or after 100 A. D.", are not similarly put out of court, but the consensus of modern criticism is no longer quite so general as Bacon imagined. "About 75-80 A. D." says Burney, while Burch places the Fourth Gospel before the Mandaean *Johannesbuch*, the earliest literary stratum in which he dates about 70 A. D. (*Structure*, page 54). Burch holds that the first draft of the Gospel was written in Aramaic "very near to the time of the One whose history it is" (*Structure*, page 214). He says that the "contents and structure of the original text . . . ask that its date be put near to the time of the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ" (*Structure*, page 228) and on one specific relevant point argues as follows:—"It is sometimes argued that, as the Gospel has no eschatology, it must be a late document. Both points in this argument are inaccurate. The Gospel has in it the eschatology of Jesus, and it is a very early document".

Burch's "original text" is of course his assumed Aramaic prototype, which he holds to have received additions at the hand of a person who translated it into Greek and was a different individual from the writer in Aramaic. Burch is a refreshing writer with a real appreciation of the Gospel message, and it seems clear that there was an Aramaic base behind the Greek Gospel, but it may well have existed only in the form of notes and not in that of an actual Gospel. Moreover, there does not appear to be any necessity to assign the work of translation into Greek to a hand other than that of the original writer, and the

grounds for the opinion that additions of any moment were made by another hand are not convincing. Gardner-Smith comes down on the same side as Burney and Burch in assigning an early date to the Fourth Gospel. In his view there is a *prima facie* case for putting the Fourth Gospel before the First and Third and we might tentatively suggest that "Mark" and "John" were almost contemporaries.

We should naturally expect internal evidence to throw the greater light upon the probable date of composition of the Gospel and external evidence to be of the greater value in helping to determine its date of publication. Under the heading of internal evidence there are a number of considerations and passages of which we must take account. If we had found reason for believing that the Fourth Gospel exhibited literary dependence on the Synoptics, we should have had to endorse a verdict that it is later than they, but Gardner-Smith has disposed of this widely-received myth, and we need not further consider it. A number of passages in the Fourth Gospel still however demand attention. In John V, 43 the Evangelist attributes to Jesus the words "If another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive", and Schmiedel saw in these words an allusion to the rebellion of Bar Cochba in 132-135 A. D., whence he inferred that the Gospel was written after 132 A. D. The identification is probably, and the inference certainly, wrong. There are other events besides the rebellion of Bar Cochba to which the passage might refer and, even if the identification were established beyond the shadow of a doubt, it argues a very limited appreciation of the powers of the Son of God to assume that He could not have foreseen the rebellion of Bar Cochba. The date 132 A. D. is moreover probably too late on other grounds, and we need not attach weight to this passage in fixing the date of composition of the Gospel.

The same is true of the description in John XXI, 1 as the Sea of Tiberias of the inland sheet of water more usually described as the Sea of Galilee. We are told that, although the city of Tiberias was founded early in the first century A. D., the description of the Sea of Galilee as the Sea of Tiberias is not found before the second century A. D. This sort of argument is one of the foibles of the critics, who seem quite unable to make allowance for the fact that only a very small proportion indeed of the literature of the period has survived and we cannot say what the lost portion may have contained. It cannot be denied, however, that the use of the name "Sea of Tiberias" is not usual with the Evangelist. We saw reason to believe that the chapter (XXI) in which it occurs is an integral part of the Gospel and by the same hand as the remainder, but it is quite likely, even probable, that it belongs to a later date than the rest of the Gospel, and this might well account for the difference. (The alternative description in John VI, 1 certainly looks like an addition to the original text.) Then again, in John XII, 21 the Apostle Philip is described as "of Bethsaida of Galilee," and Forbes states that the district in which Bethsaida lay was not incorporated in Galilee until 84 A. D. (Johannine Literature,

page 279). This is not however inconsistent with the possibility that the words in question were added after 84 A. D. to a draft completed before that date but not published until later. The really vital passage from this point of view, as P. V. Smith appreciated, is John V, 2—"Now there IS in Jerusalem, by the sheep market, a pool . . ." What is the bearing upon this passage of the fact that Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans in 70 A. D.? Lagrange is less happy than usual when he comments on this passage to the effect that the present tense does not indicate that at the time of writing Jerusalem had not yet fallen, but that the Evangelist transports himself in imagination to the time of Jesus, a highly improbable suggestion. At first sight Burney's point that in the Aramaic language there is no difference between "is" and "was" seems to suggest the possibility of a mistake by the translator if, as Burney believes, the Fourth Gospel was first written in Aramaic and then translated into Greek. If, however, we suppose that the translation was made after Jerusalem had fallen, the translator must have been aware of the fact and would not be misled by the grammatical ambiguity in his original. On the contrary the plain inference is that this passage at least was written before the fall of Jerusalem and that the Greek text of the Gospel was partially, if not wholly, finished by that time.

Let us now consider the external evidence insofar as it throws light on the date of publication of the Fourth Gospel. The problem of its authorship will come up for consideration at a later stage.

Tatian's Diatessaron, the earliest known Harmony of the Gospels, has hitherto been regarded as furnishing the earliest undisputed evidence of the existence of the Fourth Gospel, but it was not drawn up until 170 A. D., and the discovery of Rylands Papyrus 457 pushes back for more than a couple of decades the latest date that could possibly be assigned to the Gospel on the basis of external evidence. There are no extant references to the Fourth Gospel as such earlier than the Diatessaron, and we are therefore driven back on possible quotations from the Gospel or possible traces of its influence in the works of other authors whose date can be either exactly or approximately determined. The problem has been narrowed by the discovery of Rylands Papyrus 457, though evidence from the works of writers only a little subsequent to the date at which that fragment was written may have a bearing on the extent of the Gospel's diffusion in those early days. Among the writers in whose works one would naturally look for evidence of an acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel are the following, the dates in brackets after the name of each but the last being taken from Rainy's volume on "The Ancient Catholic Church" in the International Theological Library—Clement of Rome (about 96 A. D.), Ignatius (115 A. D.), Polycarp (soon after 115 A. D.), Epistle of Barnabas (between 117 and 131 A. D.), Justin Martyr (about 150 A. D.), Epistle to Diognetus (2nd century), Odes of Solomon (date doubtful).

The passages on which the argument turns are very fully set out in Lagrange's Commentary, and considerations of space prevent their complete reproduction here, though a few of the more crucial will receive mention. As regards Clement of Rome, Lagrange says that, if there is dependence, it is on the part of the Fourth Gospel, which—he holds—is unlikely. The Letters of Ignatius do not name the Fourth Gospel, but Lagrange is able to cite a large number of parallel passages, of which none is very close, except that between John III, 8 and Philadelphians VII, 1, where Ignatius uses of the Holy Spirit the words "POTHEIN ERCHETAI KAI POU HYPAGEI" (Carpenter thinks that the analogy is not with John III, 8 but with John VIII, 14). Another Ignatian passage "Jesus Christ is the Door of the Father" reminds one forcibly of the Good Shepherd discourse. Lagrange notes that the texts are not quotations, but holds that Ignatius had received a deep impression of the doctrine expressed by John, while Von der Goltz thinks that there was a current theology of Asia Minor of which the Fourth Gospel and Ignatius are alike expressions. A somewhat different possibility is mentioned by Howard, when he says that "if Ignatius (and Justin Martyr) have not borrowed Johannine language for sacramental purposes, they have drawn on a common vocabulary in the Christian Church". On the other hand Sadler (Gospel, page xxv), writing on the words "I desire the bread of God . . . which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, Who was of the seed of David, and I desire as a drink His blood, which is love incorruptible, and eternal life" in Ignatius' Epistle to the Romans, says that "Ignatius could not have derived such a passage except from the Fourth Gospel or from the oral teaching of St. John." Such a verdict tempts one to the retort "Why not?"

In the case of Polycarp of Smyrna, what Hoskyns calls his "poignant cry" that "everyone that shall not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is anti-Christ" has a Johannine ring, though the comparison is with the Epistles (I John II, 4 or II John 7) rather than with anything in the Gospel. Lagrange thinks that the absence of any mention of the Gospel in Polycarp would be inexplicable if the Gospel had issued from a circle saturated with its doctrines.

In Jackson's view the connecting links between the Epistle of Barnabas and the Fourth Gospel are at most such as to suggest a phraseology not so much borrowed as already current coin, and this is reminiscent of Howard's verdict in the case of Ignatius.

If we place Justin Martyr's First Apology about 150 A. D. and the Dialogus about 155 A. D., the work of this writer is the last we need consider in the present connection. Opinion varies too much as to the dates of the Epistle to Diognetus and the Odes of Solomon to permit of any helpful conclusion being drawn from them. Jackson finds Johannine notes ringing out in the former, and in the latter Lagrange mentions the phrase "that the light may not be overcome by the darkness" as the only close parallel. As regards Justin, Schmiedel points out that in the three cases where he appears to quote from the Fourth

Gospel the apparent quotations are so far from following John's language exactly that in every case it can be thought that he took them from another book. He holds that "the discourses of the travelling teachers of the time, of whom there were very many, may have given currency to a number of catchwords, phrases and whole sentences which became the common property of all more or less cultured Christians" and "it may be that the Fourth Evangelist availed himself of them". We cannot doubt that there was a mass of floating tradition, but Schmiedel gives insufficient weight to the probability that it and the Fourth Gospel had a common origin in the life and teaching of Jesus. Forbes thinks that Justin and other early writers who, in his opinion, show some knowledge of the sayings of the Fourth Gospel are apparently unacquainted with the narratives. Perhaps the closest analogy to the language of the Fourth Gospel in the pages of Justin is to be found in the passage "Except ye be born again ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven", of which Carpenter remarks that the words "might have been heard" by Justin "in Church teaching without being a conscious quotation".

On the whole there does not appear to be conclusive evidence to support Moffatt's claim that "the wide diffusion of the Fourth Gospel can be PROVED as early as the first quarter of the second century A. D." Such wide diffusion there MAY have been, but on the evidence before us it does not seem to be proved.

In general the evidence of quotation has seemed more cogent to those who would assign an earlier date to the Gospel than to those who would assign a later date. Those who argue from the resemblances between passages in the works of Ignatius and his fellows and passages in the Fourth Gospel that those writers must have known the Gospel are however strengthening the argument for the Gospel's early date by weakening the argument for its authority. If the Fourth Gospel does record details of the actual life and one aspect of the teaching of Jesus, it is hardly conceivable that the knowledge of these remained locked up in a single breast and was not otherwise ascertainable.

We have thus seen that the internal evidence of the Fourth Gospel is perfectly consistent with its having been written in whole or in part well before the end of the first century A. D., while the discovery of Rylands Papyrus 457 fixes the latest date for its composition not later than 150 A. D. and probably a good deal earlier, but that positive evidence of the publication of the Gospel is strikingly absent from the works of writers who might have been expected to have used it had they known it. Lord Charnwood has suggested that the Fourth Gospel is "the kind of book that people are inclined to keep for their private consumption" and he thinks that the Gospel "had to win its way". The same writer remarks that "the occasions when quotations would be to the purpose are immensely more frequent in the case of the other Gospels". This may partly account for the presence of about one hundred quotations from the Synoptics in the pages of

Justin as compared with three possible echoes from the Fourth Gospel. The point must not be pressed unduly. A fresh discovery in Egypt or elsewhere may push further back the latest possible date for the publication of the Gospel, but it is most unlikely that evidence will ever be forthcoming to prove its wide diffusion in the first half of the second century A. D., and the simplest explanation is that the absence of evidence is due to the fact that the Gospel, though composed at a much earlier date, was not widely diffused until much later. This is a vital point which we must bear in mind when summing up the evidence in the light of which we shall presently seek to rediscover the Gospel's early history.

CHAPTER X.

WHO WROTE THE FOURTH GOSPEL? THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

We now come to another stage of our enquiry, that at which we must seek to identify the author of the Fourth Gospel. The place of origin of the Gospel can be more profitably discussed when we have arrived at an opinion on this question of authorship. It is a question that must be considered firstly on the basis of the evidence afforded by the Gospel itself (the internal evidence) and then on the basis of evidence external to the Gospel and derived from other writings.

Nolloth's argument is as follows. In the Synoptic Gospels three men, Peter, James and John, form an inner circle within the Twelve in personal attendance on Jesus. In the Fourth Gospel the Sons of Zebedee are mentioned only in the Appendix (Chapter XXI), and even in the Appendix their names are not mentioned. Why has the author of the Fourth Gospel drawn a veil over the Sons of Zebedee? Either, it is suggested, because he entertained a personal dislike for them or because he was himself one of them. The former possibility is unlikely to be the right one, if he was an intimate associate of Jesus. If on the other hand he was one of the Sons of Zebedee, he is likely to have been John in view of the early martyrdom of James.

Now let us pause in the argument to collect a few relevant observations from other sources. Westcott had anticipated Nolloth in putting forward the suggestion that in John XXI, 2 the writer would have named the Sons of Zebedee unless he had himself been one of them, but Lagrange throws out a hint that the mention of the Sons of Zebedee in this one place in the Gospel is the result of the accidental incorporation of a marginal gloss in the text. This, if correct, certainly does not weaken the case for attributing the authorship of the Gospel to John, son of Zebedee. Lord Charnwood thinks that perhaps "some deeply-tragic lifelong emotion made it hard for St. John to speak of his brother". If so, this may well have resulted from his brother's martyrdom.

In the Fourth Gospel appears a "disciple whom Jesus loved". Since he was the object of Jesus' special affection, he was in all probability one of the inner circle of three. Whether the writer of the Gospel would refer to himself as the "disciple whom Jesus loved" is a question of taste. Schmiedel thinks that, if the term was used by the author to indicate himself, he was "an incredibly presumptuous person". On this ground he suggests that the term was used of the Beloved Disciple by one of his devoted admirers rather than by the Beloved Disciple of himself. Schmiedel's psychological estimate will not however commend itself to everyone. What is more natural than that an old man should dwell with especial fondness, and perhaps a little of the vanity of age, on the relationship which had subsisted between his Lord and himself in the far-off days of his youth? Eisler, who for his part identifies the

The passages on which the argument turns are very fully set out in Lagrange's Commentary, and considerations of space prevent their complete reproduction here, though a few of the more crucial will receive mention. As regards Clement of Rome, Lagrange says that, if there is dependence, it is on the part of the Fourth Gospel, which—he holds—is unlikely. The Letters of Ignatius do not name the Fourth Gospel, but Lagrange is able to cite a large number of parallel passages, of which none is very close, except that between John III, 8 and Philadelphians VII, 1, where Ignatius uses of the Holy Spirit the words "POTHEN ERCHETAI KAI POU HYPAGEI" (Carpenter thinks that the analogy is not with John III, 8 but with John VIII, 14). Another Ignatian passage "Jesus Christ is the Door of the Father" reminds one forcibly of the Good Shepherd discourse. Lagrange notes that the texts are not quotations, but holds that Ignatius had received a deep impression of the doctrine expressed by John, while Von der Goltz thinks that there was a current theology of Asia Minor of which the Fourth Gospel and Ignatius are alike expressions. A somewhat different possibility is mentioned by Howard, when he says that "if Ignatius (and Justin Martyr) have not borrowed Johannine language for sacramental purposes, they have drawn on a common vocabulary in the Christian Church". On the other hand Sadler (Gospel, page xxv), writing on the words "I desire the bread of God . . . which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, Who was of the seed of David, and I desire as a drink His blood, which is love incorruptible, and eternal life" in Ignatius' Epistle to the Romans, says that "Ignatius could not have derived such a passage except from the Fourth Gospel or from the oral teaching of St. John." Such a verdict tempts one to the retort "Why not?"

In the case of Polycarp of Smyrna, what Hoskyns calls his "poignant cry" that "everyone that shall not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is anti-Christ" has a Johannine ring, though the comparison is with the Epistles (I John II, 4 or II John 7) rather than with anything in the Gospel. Lagrange thinks that the absence of any mention of the Gospel in Polycarp would be inexplicable if the Gospel had issued from a circle saturated with its doctrines.

In Jackson's view the connecting links between the Epistle of Barnabas and the Fourth Gospel are at most such as to suggest a phraseology not so much borrowed as already current coin, and this is reminiscent of Howard's verdict in the case of Ignatius.

If we place Justin Martyr's First Apology about 150 A. D. and the Dialogus about 155 A. D., the work of this writer is the last we need consider in the present connection. Opinion varies too much as to the dates of the Epistle to Diognetus and the Odes of Solomon to permit of any helpful conclusion being drawn from them. Jackson finds Johannine notes ringing out in the former, and in the latter Lagrange mentions the phrase "that the light may not be overcome by the darkness" as the only close parallel. As regards Justin, Schmiedel points out that in the three cases where he appears to quote from the Fourth

Gospel the apparent quotations are so far from following John's language exactly that in every case it can be thought that he took them from another book. He holds that "the discourses of the travelling teachers of the time, of whom there were very many, may have given currency to a number of catchwords, phrases and whole sentences which became the common property of all more or less cultured Christians" and "it may be that the Fourth Evangelist availed himself of them". We cannot doubt that there was a mass of floating tradition, but Schmiedel gives insufficient weight to the probability that it and the Fourth Gospel had a common origin in the life and teaching of Jesus. Forbes thinks that Justin and other early writers who, in his opinion, show some knowledge of the sayings of the Fourth Gospel are apparently unacquainted with the narratives. Perhaps the closest analogy to the language of the Fourth Gospel in the pages of Justin is to be found in the passage "Except ye be born again ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven", of which Carpenter remarks that the words "might have been heard" by Justin "in Church teaching without being a conscious quotation".

On the whole there does not appear to be conclusive evidence to support Moffatt's claim that "the wide diffusion of the Fourth Gospel can be PROVED as early as the first quarter of the second century A. D." Such wide diffusion there MAY have been, but on the evidence before us it does not seem to be proved.

In general the evidence of quotation has seemed more cogent to those who would assign an earlier date to the Gospel than to those who would assign a later date. Those who argue from the resemblances between passages in the works of Ignatius and his fellows and passages in the Fourth Gospel that those writers must have known the Gospel are however strengthening the argument for the Gospel's early date by weakening the argument for its authority. If the Fourth Gospel does record details of the actual life and one aspect of the teaching of Jesus, it is hardly conceivable that the knowledge of these remained locked up in a single breast and was not otherwise ascertainable.

We have thus seen that the internal evidence of the Fourth Gospel is perfectly consistent with its having been written in whole or in part well before the end of the first century A. D., while the discovery of Rylands Papyrus 457 fixes the latest date for its composition not later than 150 A. D. and probably a good deal earlier, but that positive evidence of the publication of the Gospel is strikingly absent from the works of writers who might have been expected to have used it had they known it. Lord Charnwood has suggested that the Fourth Gospel is "the kind of book that people are inclined to keep for their private consumption" and he thinks that the Gospel "had to win its way". The same writer remarks that "the occasions when quotations would be to the purpose are immensely more frequent in the case of the other Gospels". This may partly account for the presence of about one hundred quotations from the Synoptics in the pages of

Justin as compared with three possible echoes from the Fourth Gospel. The point must not be pressed unduly. A fresh discovery in Egypt or elsewhere may push further back the latest possible date for the publication of the Gospel, but it is most unlikely that evidence will ever be forthcoming to prove its wide diffusion in the first half of the second century A. D., and the simplest explanation is that the absence of evidence is due to the fact that the Gospel, though composed at a much earlier date, was not widely diffused until much later. This is a vital point which we must bear in mind when summing up the evidence in the light of which we shall presently seek to rediscover the Gospel's early history.

CHAPTER X.

WHO WROTE THE FOURTH GOSPEL? THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

We now come to another stage of our enquiry, that at which we must seek to identify the author of the Fourth Gospel. The place of origin of the Gospel can be more profitably discussed when we have arrived at an opinion on this question of authorship. It is a question that must be considered firstly on the basis of the evidence afforded by the Gospel itself (the internal evidence) and then on the basis of evidence external to the Gospel and derived from other writings.

Nolloth's argument is as follows. In the Synoptic Gospels three men, Peter, James and John, form an inner circle within the Twelve in personal attendance on Jesus. In the Fourth Gospel the Sons of Zebedee are mentioned only in the Appendix (Chapter XXI), and even in the Appendix their names are not mentioned. Why has the author of the Fourth Gospel drawn a veil over the Sons of Zebedee? Either, it is suggested, because he entertained a personal dislike for them or because he was himself one of them. The former possibility is unlikely to be the right one, if he was an intimate associate of Jesus. If on the other hand he was one of the Sons of Zebedee, he is likely to have been John in view of the early martyrdom of James.

Now let us pause in the argument to collect a few relevant observations from other sources. Westcott had anticipated Nolloth in putting forward the suggestion that in John XXI, 2 the writer would have named the Sons of Zebedee unless he had himself been one of them, but Lagrange throws out a hint that the mention of the Sons of Zebedee in this one place in the Gospel is the result of the accidental incorporation of a marginal gloss in the text. This, if correct, certainly does not weaken the case for attributing the authorship of the Gospel to John, son of Zebedee. Lord Charnwood thinks that perhaps "some deeply-tragic lifelong emotion made it hard for St. John to speak of his brother". If so, this may well have resulted from his brother's martyrdom.

In the Fourth Gospel appears a "disciple whom Jesus loved". Since he was the object of Jesus' special affection, he was in all probability one of the inner circle of three. Whether the writer of the Gospel would refer to himself as the "disciple whom Jesus loved" is a question of taste. Schmiedel thinks that, if the term was used by the author to indicate himself, he was "an incredibly presumptuous person". On this ground he suggests that the term was used of the Beloved Disciple by one of his devoted admirers rather than by the Beloved Disciple of himself. Schmiedel's psychological estimate will not however commend itself to everyone. What is more natural than that an old man should dwell with especial fondness, and perhaps a little of the vanity of age, on the relationship which had subsisted between his Lord and himself in the far-off days of his youth? Eisler, who for his part identifies the

Beloved Disciple with Lazarus of Bethany, mentions that among the ancients Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, Eusebius, Epiphanius and St. Jerome accepted the identification with St. John. Among the moderns Lord Charnwood says that "a little consideration makes it evident that we are meant to take him (the Beloved Disciple) to be the Apostle John" and Howard, arriving at the same conclusion, adds that "the identity was never called in question until the critical difficulties attending the Johannine authorship were acutely felt and the denial of this identification seemed to offer a way of escape". The Beloved Disciple was present at the Last Supper, at which, we may infer from the Synoptics, only Apostles were present. He attained a great age (John XXI) and, unless a great volume of tradition is sadly in error, so did the Apostle John. In the Fourth Gospel John the Baptist is referred to simply as John, thus implying, once more according to Nolloth, "either that no other John entered into the history or, if there were such a man, he was of too little account to require to be distinguished from the Baptist". If this other John were the author of the Gospel, his attitude to the Baptist, whose disciple he almost certainly had been, would not necessarily be inconsistent with his adoption of the title of the Beloved Disciple.

Nolloth's conclusion on the whole argument is that "there are few instances in the whole range of literature in which a question of authorship is so satisfactorily solved by appeal to internal evidence as in the case before us". We must however notice some counter-arguments.

The question of the identification of the Beloved Disciple and that of the discovery of the author of the Gospel are not necessarily identical, for it is quite possible to argue, as we found Schmiedel doing just now, that the two were separate and distinct persons. Among the Allegorists Scott thinks that the Beloved Disciple represents the Church, while Loisy sees in him "the typical disciple according to the Spirit." We have already examined the method of interpretation adopted by this school of thought and found it wanting. We noted too Eisler's fanciful identification of the Beloved Disciple with Lazarus of Bethany. Equally fanciful is that of Reville, who suggests Nathanael.

The real interest of the search for the identity of the Beloved Disciple lies in our expectation of finding in him the author of the Gospel. Sanders (among others) rather superficially argues that "the fact that the Beloved Disciple REMAINED by the Cross makes it difficult to identify him with any of the disciples known to the Synoptic tradition SINCE THEY HAD ALL FORSAKEN JESUS AND FLED". What can be the source of this critic's information that the Beloved Disciple REMAINED by the Cross, when all that the Gospel tells us is that he was standing by at a specific moment, a very different matter, and why indeed should not an Apostle who had forsaken his Master and fled have recovered his courage and returned later to the scene of the tragedy? Then again it is suggested by others that the Beloved Disciple was the owner of the house where the Last Supper

was eaten. So say Delff, Bousset, von Soden and Swete. If so, he was probably a Jerusalemite, and this view is thought to be supported by the statement that he took the mother of Jesus to his own home from the hour of Jesus' commission (John XIX, 27). It is indeed unlikely, though not impossible, that the Apostle John had a house of his own at Jerusalem, but the identification with the host at the Last Supper is problematical, and all that John XIX, 27 implies is that wherever the Beloved Disciple made his abode there was Mary's home.

We have now to estimate the weight to be attached to two arguments that are put forward—one on the score of alleged illiteracy and the other on that of inconsistency of character—with the object of showing that John, son of Zebedee, cannot have been the author of the Fourth Gospel. As a typical example of the former we may cite Eisler, who finds this John "an illiterate and unlearned man, of whom not a single word is reported in Luke or Acts". Further points tending to the same conclusion are made by Forbes, when he opines that the expectation of an early Second Coming would tend to prevent study and culture such as the Fourth Gospel displays (Johnannine Literature, pages 170-1) and by Garvie, when he remarks "How dull these disciples were". Even Archbishop Bernard, while holding that to call John "illiterate and ignorant" would be to exaggerate, thinks that the words used of him in Acts IV, 13—*AGRAMMATOS KAI IDIOTES*—do not suggest that he was a man of learning or literary gifts (Commentary, page xxxvi).

As against this let us first cite Jackson, who will not be suspected of prejudice in this connection when he says that "ignorant and unlearned" would simply mean that, unlike St. Paul, he was no trained theologian, unversed in rabbinic lore. Moulton Mulligan, while holding that *AGRAMMATOS* (without letters) ordinarily means "unable to read or write", points out that in some contexts "letters" means the writings of Moses (Vocabulary of the New Testament). To the Jewish authorities Jesus Himself is one of the ignorant crowd (John VII, 15). Bernard may well underestimate the social position of John's father Zebedee when he describes him as "the proprietor of a fishing boat on the Lake of Galilee". The Greek "Acts of James", surviving in a twelfth-century manuscript but representing what was possibly an almost contemporary opinion, describes Zebedee as "a big shipowner employing numerous craft on the Lake of Tiberias, one of the first citizens of Galilee" (cited by Eisler). Even if Bernard is nearer the truth here, we have to take account of the consideration adduced by Grandmaison, who says apropos of the "ignorant fishermen," "This objection is based on an altogether unjust assimilation of our modern castes to the social and religious state of the Israelites in the first century" (Jesus Christ, Sa Personne, Son Message, Ses Preuves, 10th edition, 1929, page 184). This argument is expanded by Lagrange as follows—"That a fisherman of the Lake of Tiberias should have had acquaintanceship with the High Priest is in no way surprising to anyone

who has taken into consideration the sincere democratic spirit of Orientals and their extreme readiness to transplant themselves and contract alliances at a distance. The doctors of the Law loved to carry on a manual trade." Nor need we be unduly influenced by the argument that the expectation of an early Second Coming would tend to prevent the study and culture displayed in the Fourth Gospel. The qualities displayed in the Gospel are to be attributed in the main to Jesus Himself, and in any event there is insufficient evidence upon which to base such a statement as that quoted from Forbes above. As regards Garvie's reference to the dullness of the disciples, it is true that some of their questions appear to us stupid, but where is a stupid question attributed to John, son of Zebedee?

Some may think that a more serious objection to the Johannine authorship springs from an apparent incompatibility of character between the Apostle John of the Synoptic record and the Fourth Evangelist. "With the Gospel in his heart", asks Carpenter, "how could the future Evangelist have been once a 'pillar' of the Circumcision at Jerusalem?" Bacon states the argument thus—"To attribute the Johannine writings to the Pillar of Galatians II, 9 or the Galilean fisherman of Mark I, 19 and IX, 38 it becomes necessary to suppose that John, after migrating to Ephesus, underwent a transformation so complete as to make him in reality another man" (Making of the New Testament, page 212).

On the other hand Lord Charnwood takes the view that "the demand to sit one on Christ's right hand and one on His left was rather the prompt volunteering of a service" than the outcome of a desire for self-aggrandisement, since in his opinion "they knew what lay before Him and them". Again P. V. Smith writes, "The stress in the Gospel on loving one another is said to be inconsistent with the desire to call down fire on a Samaritan village (Luke IX, 54) and forbidding the casting-out of devils by one not of the Apostles' company (Mark IX, 38 and Luke IX, 49), but is no allowance to be made for development of character during a long life, and is the veto on the casting-out of devils really inconsistent with what we know of John's character in his old age?" The reference is no doubt to the well-known story of St. John and Cerinthus. Finally, Burch puts the matter thus—"John was an apt pupil. His Gospel and Epistle exhibit that the man and the historian were unusually and sensitively alive to describe and understand the historic Jesus Christ unto Whom he was a disciple."

On the whole our conclusion must be that the difference between John the young man and John the aged proves on examination to be less than had at first sight appeared and that such difference as there is must be attributed to the gradually increasing assimilation of John's character to that of his Master with the passage of the years. No word of John, son of Zebedee, is indeed recorded in Acts, but does not this accord very well with the Evangelist's silence about himself in his Gospel?

This absence of personal allusion demands notice before we pass on. McClymont indeed thinks that the Evangelist's individuality has left its impress as regards form and colouring on the discourses he reports (St. John in Century Bible, page 27), but even this is to attach too much importance to the fact that our Lord spoke in Aramaic and the Evangelist was a translator as well as a reporter. Howard expresses the view that "it is one of our difficulties in understanding the inner meaning of the Johannine writings that they are completely wanting in the auto-biographical note which gives to the Pauline Epistles their rich human interest". This is however not so much a difficulty as a clue. Some wise words of Hoskyns express the truth—"He (the Evangelist) has in fact so burnt himself out of his book that we cannot be certain that we have anywhere located him as a clear intelligible figure in history. At the end of our enquiry he remains no more than a voice bearing witness to the glory of God. The author of the book has effaced himself . . . in order that the Truth may be made known and in order that the Eternal Life which is in God may be declared." There is indeed no book in the world in which the personality of the author counts for less than in the Fourth Gospel. This is because the personality of the divine person whose record fills its pages has excluded all secondary interests.

As a guarantee of its truth we need to examine the credentials of the writer of the Gospel. It is for quite a different reason that we shall briefly consider the question where it first saw the light of publicity. Here much fine scholarship has been sadly misdirected. We want to know the local conditions at the place where the Gospel was published because of the light they throw on the Evangelist's reasons for making the selection he did from among his much more voluminous material, but it is a sheer waste of time to endeavour to trace the influence of those conditions on the selected material. We came to the conclusion that the Fourth Gospel is a truthful historical record, and we cannot doubt that, had it been published immediately after the events it records, instead of more than half a century later, though some items would have been included that have now been omitted and some omitted that are now included, the bulk of its contents would have been substantially what they now are. The elaborate criticism which would see in many a passage of the Fourth Gospel the reflection of events that happened, or of movements that were in full flood, many years after the death of Jesus is perfectly futile. Nevertheless for the reason mentioned, the light which it will throw on the Evangelist's principles of selection and rejection, we need to consider the Gospel's place of publication. Burney favours Antioch and many others Palestine, but both the verdict of tradition and the vote of the majority of scholars go to Ephesus. Gardner, who applies to the problem the very principles which we have just deprecated, writes as follows—"Some of the later shoots, such as the Logos doctrine and the worship of the Virgin Mother, owe much to the influence of the atmosphere

of the Ionian cities of the coast". The reference to the Logos doctrine indicates a strange misreading of the history of doctrinal development, and we may pertinently ask where the Fourth Evangelist records the Virgin Birth, which on Gardner's principles should have been of great importance to him. Schmiedel adds that "none of the Christian writers before Irenaeus knows anything of a stay of the Apostle John in Asia Minor". Of course what he really means is that none of the Christian writers before Irenaeus records such a stay in his surviving fragments, and that is a very different matter. He goes on to refer to the prophecy in Acts XX, 29, addressed to the elders of the Church at Ephesus—"After my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock"—and according to him composed between 105 and 130 A. D. by an author "who would not have introduced into Paul's speech so unfriendly an utterance about his successors if he had had any idea that the most important and influential of these was the Apostle John" (Johannine Writings, page 175). So it looks as though we must abandon either Ephesus as the place of publication or the Apostle John as the author. This is not the case, however. Few, if any, would now support Schmiedel's dating, and in any event how about Diotrephes (III John 9)?

A very old and now discredited argument directed to the same end as Schmiedel's is stated by Gardner among others. It is to the effect that the letter of Ignatius to the Ephesians dwells on the connection of St. Paul with Ephesus, but says nothing of any connection with Ephesus on the part of St. John or any of his school, and that from this we should infer that there was in fact no such connection. The answer is that St. Paul's case was peculiarly apposite in that he had met his death at Rome and Ignatius was on his way to Rome to suffer a like fate, whereas St. John seems to have had a peaceful end and anyhow did not die at Rome.

CHAPTER XI.

WHO WROTE THE FOURTH GOSPEL? THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

We now pass from the internal evidence of authorship to the external, and this latter we must examine at some length.

In the words of Howard "Although the tradition of apostolic authorship stood practically unchallenged for nearly seventeen centuries . . . it is not until we reach the last quarter of the second century that Irenaeus provides us with our first unambiguous witness in support of the traditional theory". What Irenaeus says is that "John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned on His breast, himself also PUBLISHED the Gospel while he was dwelling at Ephesus in Asia", and he remained in the Church at Ephesus "until the times of Trajan."

Jackson makes the objection that "the Fourth Gospel was assigned by Irenaeus to the Apostle John, yet what Irenaeus does not do is expressly to designate him the Apostle". It is difficult to follow this argument, for, if Jackson was satisfied that "the Fourth Gospel was assigned by Irenaeus to THE APOSTLE John", why should he worry about Irenaeus' alleged failure "expressly to designate him THE APOSTLE"? In any event Carpenter, a critic with the same general outlook as Jackson, finally puts the latter's argument out of court when he points out that "Irenaeus twice describes John as 'the Apostle'. The term is not a casual mistake . . . Moreover Irenaeus twice uses the phrase 'John and the other Apostles'". In his Letter to Florinus Irenaeus says that Polycarp would describe his intercourse with "John and the rest who had seen the Lord" so that Irenaeus' information about John was passed to him through only one intermediary. Nevertheless Selbie can ask "Even if Polycarp told Irenaeus ALL he knew about John, what proof is there that he stated anything to fix the identity of his teacher with the son of Zebedee? EVEN IF HE MADE SUCH A STATEMENT, IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN AN ASSUMPTION ON HIS PART". Or, we may add, Polycarp might have been lying. There are of course other possibilities, but it is difficult to be patient with criticism of this kind, which, if pushed to its logical limits, threatens to bring all knowledge under suspicion.

Sanders says that "Irenaeus was the first Catholic writer to overcome the prejudice that appears to have been felt against the Fourth Gospel, at least in Rome, in the latter half of the second century A. D." Yet according to the same authority the First and Third Gospels are quoted, even by Irenaeus, much more frequently than the Fourth Gospel, roughly four and three times more often respectively. Sanders adds that "it is highly probable that it was through the influence of Irenaeus that the Fourth Gospel was eventually accepted as canonical scripture by the universal consent of the Catholic Church, when he had shown beyond the shadow of doubt that it was in fact the cornerstone of orthodoxy". Sanders may or may not be overstating his

case, but the importance of Irenaeus in the Johannine controversy is unmistakable. Hoskyns stresses this when he writes "Irenaeus did not erect an orthodoxy and impose it on the Church. He claimed to possess a tradition of authoritative apostolical teaching. In this context he seized upon the Johannine writings as of special importance". For such contribution as he made towards securing the ultimate inclusion of the Fourth Gospel in the Canon we should be grateful to Irenaeus, and, if we find that in some particulars he misunderstood its teaching, we should forgive him, for, though he may have been one of the first, he was by no means the last to do so. Nolloth thinks that he assigned the Fourth Gospel to St. John incidentally only because his opponents, the Gnostics, fully recognized its apostolical authorship.

Much prominence has been given to a passage preserved from the lost work of a writer who wrote about half-a-century before Irenaeus published his *Adversus Haereses*. This writer was Papias of Hierapolis, whose "Exposition of the Sayings of the Lord" appeared about 135 A. D., and the passage in question may be translated into English as follows—"If then anyone came who had been a follower of the Elders, I questioned him with regard to the words of the Elders—what Andrew or what Peter said, or what was said by Philip or by Thomas or by James or by John or by Matthew or by any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what Aristion and the Elder John, the disciples of the Lord, say". Unfortunately there is an ambiguity latent in the Greek text. Were "what Andrew or what Peter said or what was said by Philip or by Thomas or by James or by John or by Matthew or by any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what Aristion and the Elder John, the disciples of the Lord, say" the actual "words of the Elders" about which Papias enquired, the difference between the past and present tenses of the verb "to say" being accounted for by the fact that the former part of the enquiry related to the sayings in the past of Andrew and the rest, and the latter part of the enquiry to the current sayings of Aristion and the Elder John, both of whom were apparently still alive at the time of the enquiry? Or ought we, in order to preserve the sense of the original, to insert between "the words of the Elders" and "what Andrew or what Philip said" in our translation the two little words "as to"? To state the problem a little differently, were Andrew, Philip and the rest themselves the Elders, or were they the persons whose sayings the Elders reported? The importance of the problem lies in the fact that, if the Elders were not themselves Andrew, Philip and the rest, but on the contrary we have to distinguish between Elders and Apostles, then apparently two Johns are referred to, John the Apostle, who was presumably dead, and John the Elder, who was evidently still alive, while, if the Apostles are themselves Elders, there is no necessity to make any such assumption. It cannot be denied that the majority of scholars in recent times have seen in this passage evidence of the existence of two Johns each of

whom could be described as a "disciple of the Lord", but the die has been heavily loaded in favour of such a conclusion. On the one hand it has appealed to those who were impressed by the differences between the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse and found difficulty in assigning the two books to the same author. On the other hand it has been equally attractive to those who felt that their views of early Church organization would be put in jeopardy if the equation "Elders equals Apostles" were once accepted. There can be no doubt that Eusebius, the writer who has preserved for us the doubtful passage from Papias, would not have agreed for a moment that an Apostle could properly be described as an Elder, but it does not follow that this was not possible in the time of Papias. We may indeed see evidence of such a possibility in two Books of the New Testament which on any view are separated from Papias by a shorter interval of time than was Eusebius. In I Peter V, 1 the author describes himself as an "elder". Now either the author was the Apostle Peter, in which event the case is proved, or he was someone who wished to be mistaken for the Apostle Peter, in which case he would have been careful not to equate two mutually exclusive titles and thus expose his imposture. Again, in II John 1 and III John 1 the author describes himself as "the Elder" and, while we must not assume for the purpose of the argument that the author was necessarily the Apostle John, it is a little difficult to see how the view that he was could ever have gained acceptance if his description of himself as "the Elder" furnished convincing evidence to the contrary.

Are we to accept the view that there was a real person named John the Presbyter, who was distinct from the Apostle John? Garvie was so convinced that there was that in his translation of the passage from Papias he renders the Greek word PRESBUTEROS in one place by "Elder" and in another by "Presbyter" in order apparently to be able to bring into the passage the name "John the Presbyter", a proceeding that in anyone else than Garvie might have evoked a suspicion of disingenuity. Lord Charnwood on the other hand does not believe that there ever was such a person as John the Presbyter.

Mommsen declared that "the kernel of the Johannine controversy is Eusebius' statement concerning Papias." (Eccl. Hist. III, 39). On consideration however it would not appear that the passage from Papias has any necessary bearing on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. In contrast to Lord Charnwood it may be thought that there were many Presbyter Johns—indeed John was such a common name that it is surprising if no more than two tombs of a man of that name could be found at Ephesus at a later date. John the Presbyter, author of the Fourth Gospel, is however a mere creation of the credulous "critical" imagination. Papias certainly does not say that this second John, if there was one, wrote the Gospel.

One little gem from Carpenter deserves mention before we leave the subject of Papias. This critic says, "Irenaeus no doubt though so

(i. e. that John, the disciple of the Lord, was the son of Zebedee) and he further supposes Papias to have been his hearer, but Papias **SO FAR AS IS KNOWN** made no such claim". In view of the scantiness of Papias' extant remains the argument from silence could hardly be pushed to a greater degree of absurdity.

The masterpiece of the critics is however their theory of the early martyrdom of John, son of Zebedee. That the judgment of the critics has been influenced by preconceived notions as to the authorship of the Gospel may be suspected when we read passages such as the following from Carpenter—"If the statement attributed to Papias concerning the martyrdom of John, son of Zebedee, be accepted, the book (the Fourth Gospel) cannot have been written by him". Of course the conclusion does not follow from the premises, even if they be admitted, but let us see what evidence can be adduced in support of the premises.

Firstly, the so-called De Boor fragment, a seventh or eighth century epitome of the History of Philip of Side, itself not published until the middle of the fifth century A. D., reads as follows—"Papias in the second book says that John the theologian and James his brother were killed by the Jews".

Secondly, one of the twenty-seven extant manuscripts of a ninth-century Byzantine writer, George the Sinner, says that John, son of Zebedee, was deemed worthy of martyrdom "for Papias in the second book of the Dominical Oracles affirms that he was slain by Jews". The other twenty-six manuscripts declare that John "died in peace".

Thirdly, a Syrian martyrology dating from 411 A. D., gives under December 27th "John and James the Apostles in Jerusalem".

Fourthly, an endeavour is made to obtain support from the Gospels for the view that John, son of Zebedee, as well as his brother James, died a violent death. The text to which appeal is made is Mark X, 38-9.

Finally, a modern witness is produced. We are reminded of the great learning of Dr. Charles and told that he accepts the theory of John's early martyrdom.

In this connection it is interesting to note how Garvie manages to put in a word for John the Presbyter. He writes, "If the son of Zebedee was his brother's companion in an early martyrdom **AND THE FACT WAS NOT GENERALLY KNOWN**, one can understand how another John, living in Ephesus and also bearing witness as a disciple of Jesus, might be confused with him".

What is to be said on the other side? Sanders considers the evidence for the theory "very slight indeed." A. S. Peake refers to the "slenderness of the evidence" upon which the theory is built and opines that it "would have provoked derision if it had been adduced in favour of a conservative conclusion". The following refutation of the theory is based mainly on the writings of Bernard and Howard with comments by other writers.

As regards the De Boor fragment, the title of "theologian" applied to John is anachronistic, and James, the brother of John, was slain, not by the Jews, but by Herod Agrippa I. Irenaeus and Eusebius knew the work of Papias, but betray no knowledge of the statement attributed to him. Moreover, there is no trace of such an event in the extant fragments of early Christian literature. It was James the Lord's brother, who was killed by the Jews.

As regards Principal Garvie, the second premise is so impossible that of the statement attributed to Papias was derived, not from the work of Papias, but either from Philip of Side or from his abridgment, and, if so, he is not entitled to rank as an independent witness. As Bernard well says, "no historical inference can be drawn from a corrupt sentence in a late epitome of the work of a careless and blundering historian".

As regards the Syrian martyrology, it is likely that John the Baptist and not John the Apostle is in fact the John referred to, but in any event a martyr is a witness and not necessarily one who suffered a violent death.

The text from Mark does not necessarily imply that the brothers would meet a violent death. What it does signify is that a life of hardship and persecution should be theirs as well as their Master's, and this prophecy was abundantly fulfilled.

As regards Dr. Charles, no one in his senses would deny his immense scholarship, but even Homer is said to have nodded, and infallibility was not an attribute even of Dr. Charles.

As regards Urincipal Garvie, the second premise is so impossible that his argument need not be pursued.

It is to be noted that several Biblical MSS append a note to the Fourth Gospel that it was written from 30 to 32 years after the Ascension. (Drummond, Inquiry, page 67). The source of this very explicit information is not stated, but it would be consistent with Apostolic authorship even if the martyrdom of John, son of Zebedee, in Palestine could be proved, and consistent also with the possibility that the composition of the Gospel was a long process spread over many years. It adds force, such as it is, to the contention of those who hold that the Gospel according to John is not chronologically the Fourth Gospel.

A number of other references to the Fourth Gospel by writers ranging from the middle of the second to the end of the fourth century A. D. call for notice, not because their accuracy can in all cases be relied upon, but because they may reflect a reliable tradition, even though sometimes in a distorted form.

Firstly, we have to take account of the fact, pointed out by Eisler (Enigma of the Fourth Gospel, 1937) that "the identification of John, son of Zebedee with the Ephesian John, supposed to be the beloved disciple of Jesus mentioned in John XXI, 24 as the writer of the Fourth Gospel, is not found in any orthodox author of the second

century A. D., but only and exclusively in the heretical so-called Leucian 'Acts of John,' which are generally attributed to the years around 160 A. D." In this connection it must be pointed out that, while undue importance must not be attributed to this work, the fact that a book is heretical and pseudonymous does not necessarily imply that every statement therein is untrue. The author of such a book would as a rule avoid throwing down a challenge to tradition on a non-essential point. The really important consideration, however, is not so much the statement of the Leucian "Acts of John" as the absence of similar statements from the writings of other contemporary writers of greater repute. It must be remembered however in the first place that a fact may often be unmentioned because it is well-known and generally received and in the second place that only a microscopic portion of the Christian literature of this early period has come down to us, a vital consideration when it is sought to draw an inference on purely negative grounds.

Lagrange points out that Apollinarius of Hierapolis, writing against the Montanists about 170 A. D., did not for a moment question the authority of the Fourth Gospel, although, since the Montanists were the ultra-Johannine party, the temptation to do so must have been almost irresistible had Apollinarius been aware of any possible ground of challenge.

Very interesting is the extract from the letter written by Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus to Pope Victor about 190 A. D. and quoted by Eusebus (bishop of Caesarea from 314 to 340 A. D.). Jackson translates as follows—"In Asia also mighty elements of the Church have fallen asleep, Philip of the twelve Apostles at Hierapolis and his two aged virgin daughters, another of his daughters at Ephesus. Moreover, John, he that reclined in the bosom of the Lord, who as priest wore the sacred plate, martyr and teacher, he too fell asleep at Ephesus". A number of points emerge here. Philip is referred to as "of the twelve Apostles", while John is not so described. Some of the critics have however somewhat spoiled their case here by suggesting that Polycrates was in error and that the Philip who died at Hierapolis was Philip the Evangelist (of Acts VIII) and not Philip the Apostle. If there was any doubt in the matter, Polycrates may well have added the words "of the twelve Apostles" to make clear to which Philip he intended to refer, and whether his identification was right or wrong does not affect the probability. If in John's case there was no doubt, it would be unnecessary to identify him as an Apostle. Then again the reference to the wearing of the Petalon or sacred plate is a real puzzle. Some have seen in the words used a suggestion that John was actually High Priest and dismissed it as absurd. Eisler, accepting the suggestion, identifies the writer of the Gospel with Theophilus, son of Annas and himself High Priest from 37 to 41 A. D., instead of with John, son of Zebedee. Others have regarded the words as having a purely figurative significance, expressive of

authority and influence, and this seems to be the majority view. Thirdly, John is described as "martyr", and it has been thought that this is indicative of a violent death. The Greek word MARTYR does not however necessarily carry this meaning—it means primarily "a witness" and there is such a thing as "white martyrdom" which may be suffered apart from a violent death. Finally, we should note the association of John with Ephesus.

Next to be considered is the Muratorian Canon, an inscription discovered by Muratori (1674-1750 A. D.) at Milan in 1740 A. D. The relevant portion of the inscription is thus translated by the Abbe Constant Fouard (St. John and the Close of the Apostolic Age, 1905)—

"John, one of the disciples, composed the Fourth Gospel at the solicitation of the other disciples and of his companions in the episcopacy. Fast with me for three days, he said to them, and we will make known to one another whatsoever shall be revealed unto us. That same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that John was to write the whole in his own name under the supervision of the others. This then is why, although each of the Gospels begins its teachings after a different fashion, that fact in no way affects the faith of believers, since it is the breath of one almighty and sole Spirit which proclaims everything that concerns the Birth, the Passion, the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, His conversation with His disciples, His twofold Coming, the first in lowliness and contempt, which has already taken place, the second in His royal and glorious power, which is to come. Why need we be surprised therefore when John, even in his Epistles, so strongly asserts each fact, since he could well say of himself, That which our eyes have seen, our ears have heard, our hands have handled, that is what we are writing for you. Thereby he declares that he has been not an eyewitness only, but a hearer as well, and the writer of all the marvelous deeds of the Lord whose history he has compiled."

Of this Jackson has four criticisms to offer. He says that John's Gospel is apparently referred to a period earlier than the Synoptics, that John is differentiated as a disciple from certain Apostles, of whom Andrew is one, that his Gospel is not exclusively his own independent work, and that the locality of composition is transferred from Ephesus to Palestine. The first and fourth of these comments may be dealt with together. The points made by Jackson are met if we suppose that the Fourth Gospel was begun at an early date in Palestine and finished and given to the world many years later at Ephesus. As regards the second comment, it is to be observed that the word "apostle" is not found in the Fourth Gospel, which uses the older term "disciple" which John evidently preferred. Is there anything unusual in giving to a man the title he prefers? Moreover in this very passage the "disciples" with whom Jesus' conversations are said to be recorded are quite evidently the Apostles. As regards the third comment, the value of the Fourth Gospel in the eyes of most people will not be

impaired if it is conceded that in composing it the author had the benefit of the advice of others who were themselves eyewitnesses.

Another witness believed by the critics to give evidence unfavourable to the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel is Clement of Alexandria (about 150 to about 220 A. D. according to Rainy). Dr. Charles reads him as stating that all the Apostles were dead before the death of Nero, but Lord Charnwood points out that the passage seems to refer to the teaching mission of the Apostles in a broad sense. Clement in the same work gives information about St. John's life in Asia long after, and no inconsistency with this is implied by his further statement that originally John went east.

CHAPTER XII.

WHO WROTE THE FOURTH GOSPEL?—THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE (continued); QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPEL FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT; GENERAL SUMMING-UP ON THE QUESTION OF THE ORIGIN OF THE GOSPEL.

Victorinus of Pettau in Upper Pannonia (martyred 304 A. D.) has the following passage, as quoted by Carpenter—"All the bishops of the neighbouring provinces came to John and constrained him to put his own testimony into writing." This evidently refers, not to the incident recorded in the Muratorian Canon, but to the final stage in the production of the Gospel. The bishops were probably aware that John had in his possession written matter that might serve as the basis of a Gospel, but may not have known its extent. They were doubtless dignitaries of the Churches of Asia who did not wish the venerable Apostle to pass to his rest without leaving his testimony in a form available for the use of posterity.

The evidence of Eusebius himself is that "they say that he (John) accepted them (the first three Gospels), bearing witness to their truth, but adding that there was only wanting to their record the narrative of what was done by Christ at first and at the beginning of his preaching" (iii, 24). We found in the course of our detailed comparison between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel how large a measure of agreement there is between their representations, and, in face of our conclusions, we shall not be surprised to find that John bore witness to the truth of the Synoptics. Of course, even apart from the final scenes, the Fourth Gospel does not deal entirely with a period previous to that covered by the Synoptics. Where they describe the same events and present a measure of disagreement, sometimes only apparent but on occasion real (as e. g. in the matter of the day of the Crucifixion), it is unlikely that John set out deliberately to correct the Synoptics. It is far more probable that he contented himself with giving what he knew to be the true version of events and left it to others so inclined to search for discrepancies.

In 303 A. D. an Edict of Diocletian ordered the wholesale confiscation and destruction of the sacred books of the Christian Church. The Constantinian Rescript of Milan (313 A. D.) restored freedom of worship to the Church, and a new edition of the Gospels was then prepared and prefaces added to it. Eisler (*The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel*, 1937) compares Fortunatian's Preface to John (about 313 A. D.) with the Preface to John in the New Testament edition of Lucinius of Baetica (soon after 391 A. D.) and St. Jerome "On Illustrious Men" (392 A. D.). According to Fortunatian, purporting to quote Papias of Hierapolis' "Exposition of the Sayings of the Lord", "the Gospel of John was revealed to the Churches by John while he was still in his body". The expression "revealed to the Churches" is very appropriate if we are right in believing that the Gospel was the

result of a long process, but the words "while he was still in his body" are indeed curious. The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures, Vol. II, Part I gives the passage from Papias in a slightly different form as "The Gospel of John was published and given to the Churches (of Asia, according to the tenth-century Codex Toletanus) by John while yet in the body" and comments at page xv "This contradicts a conjecture of some recent writers that the Gospel appeared only after St. John's death" It certainly does, but it is difficult to see how John could have either revealed or published and given his Gospel to the Churches when he was no longer in the body, and the curious phrase may therefore indicate that the idea that the Gospel appeared only after the death of the Evangelist was held by some even in Papias' day. It may well be however that the real solution is to be found by way of deleting the words "by John" and accepting the view that the publication of the Gospel took place during the last days of the aged Apostle but that on account of his weakness of body the actual publication was effected by others on his behalf. This is suggested by Hoare in his interesting work on "The Original Order and Chapters of St. John's Gospel" and the suggestion certainly seems to derive support from John XXI, 24.

After declaring that the Gospel of John was revealed to the Churches by John while he was still in his body, the extract from Papias reproduced by Fortunatian and quoted by Eisler goes on to state that Papias (or was it Marcion?) wrote the Gospel at the dictation of John whose disciple he was. On this Eisler remarks that "the prologue to Luke . . . cannot be derived from the same source as the preface to the Fourth Gospel . . . since it says that John himself wrote his Gospel, while the preface to the Fourth Evangel says that he dictated it to a scribe". This line of argument is surely unsound. We say that Milton wrote "Paradise Lost", although in fact his blindness compelled him to dictate it, and nobody misunderstands us.

Lucinius says that "John the Apostle whom the Lord Jesus loved most wrote as the last of all his Gospel at the request of the bishops of Asia" against Cerinthus and the Ebionites (who denied the pre-existence of Jesus), that he approved of the Synoptic Gospels but pointed out that they recorded only the history of one year after John the Baptist suffered and that he therefore narrated the deeds of the Lord before John the Baptist was put in prison. "The Gospel then, written after the Apocalypse, was revealed and given to the Churches in Asia". Much of this we have already encountered elsewhere. When the Lucinian preface is compared with St. Jerome, however, we find that, although Epiphanius was the source used by both writers, Jerome inserts in his description of John the words "the son of Zebedee and the brother of James the Apostle, whom Herod decapitated" which are omitted by Lucinius. There is however no evidence to support Eisler's view that the omission was made "deliberately". Lucinius may well have thought the words superfluous, and the suggestion that he "flat-

ly refused to accept the equation" is groundless. At that period it would not have been difficult to find a string of authorities to support the identification. We must not assume that, if an early writer mentions the Fourth Evangelist without specifically identifying him with the son of Zebedee, he does not believe in the accuracy of the identification, while if he does specifically identify the Fourth Evangelist with the son of Zebedee that is evidence that there was a current difference of opinion on the subject.

Our last appeal to an ancient authority in the present connection must be to Epiphanius direct. This writer, who belongs to the middle of the fourth century A. D., places the composition of the Fourth Gospel after the Apostle's return from Patmos, but under Claudius Caesar (41-54 A. D.). At first sight this appears an impossible conjecture, but it may be the reflection of an early tradition that the composition of the Fourth Gospel began during the principate of Claudius, and that tradition may not have been far from the truth. Undue significance must not be attached to the fact that the Gospel according to John is generally known as "the Fourth Gospel". This is sufficiently accounted for by its place in the New Testament canon. Modern scholarship holds that the Gospel according to Mark is the oldest of the Gospels, but no one would think on that account of describing it as "the First Gospel", a title which belongs to Matthew's Gospel on positional grounds.

Before we leave this part of our subject one or two modern writers may usefully be quoted. Thus Moffatt, while not accepting it, refers to "the idea that 'John' was written when the circle of the Apostles was still unbroken" (Introduction, 3rd Edition, page 15). Carpenter mentions that tradition placed the teaching of Andrew in Bithynia. Andrew may well have had a much closer connection with the Fourth Gospel than is generally recognized. Finally Renan (*Life of Jesus*) held that the Fourth Gospel was used for a long while in a particular, otherwise unknown, Christian community in Asia Minor before it was offered to the Church at large.

We must now very briefly examine the bearing on the problem before us of the Evangelist's quotations from the Old Testament. The Hebrew Scriptures of the Old Testament would have been available to the Evangelist in the original Hebrew, in the Septuagint and possibly in other Greek versions "perhaps current in Palestine" (Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 2nd edition, page 398). Sometimes Hebrew, Septuagint and Gospel are in agreement; sometimes the Gospel follows the Hebrew and sometimes the Septuagint; while on other occasions the Gospel departs from both Hebrew and Septuagint. In these last cases the Gospel may follow one of the other Greek versions just mentioned. A notable example is furnished by John XIII, 18, rendered in the Authorized English version "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen; but that the scripture may be fulfilled 'He that eateth bread with Me' hath lifted up his heel against

Me'". The quotation is attributed to Jesus Himself and differs from both Hebrew and Septuagint in that it omits the equivalent of the words "on whom I trusted" which appears in both Hebrew and Septuagint after the words translated "eateth bread with Me". The words "on whom I trusted" were not applicable by Jesus to Judas, for Jesus "knew all men" (John II, 24) and "knew what was in man" (John II, 25). The quotation of a text other than that represented by the Hebrew or Septuagint is therefore understandable and is evidence of the authenticity of the words attributed by the Evangelist to Jesus.

Most of the quotations from the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel are made by the Evangelist, and their variations between the Hebrew, the Septuagint and independence of both are consistent with the view that the composition of the Gospel extended over a long period of time and possibly was carried out partly in Palestine and partly elsewhere. The Evangelist sometimes quotes very freely or in general terms, which may mean that he was relying on his memory without reference to any written authority.

We must now sum up the general conclusions to which our investigation has led us. Broadly the picture that is presented to us is the following.

The Apostle John made notes in Aramaic of some of the discourses of Jesus very soon after they were delivered. At a later, but still early, date he decided, possibly—though we must not dogmatise—on advice from some of his fellow-disciples, among whom Andrew may have played a prominent part, to write a consecutive account of Jesus' ministry, and in so doing he would have the benefit of his notes, of a recollection inspired by the Holy Spirit, and probably of the advice of his fellow-disciples. Whether this consecutive account or first draft of the Gospel—as distinct from the original notes—was written in Aramaic or in Greek is doubtful, but in the former event it was translated into Greek before the Fall of Jerusalem.

At intervals over a long period of time the Apostle added to his draft or deleted therefrom. During the whole of this long period there was probably only one copy of the work in existence, but the Apostle used the material in it in the course and for the purpose of his own oral teaching. In its original form it was the earliest of the Gospels, but in its final form the last. This final form was probably influenced by the inclusions and omissions of other Gospels, these and the needs of his own hearers deciding him what to leave out from matter of greater bulk. When he felt the approach of death he added the last chapter, but the Gospel was not issued until immediately before, or possibly just after, his death at Ephesus in 100 A. D., and about this time the single manuscript may have suffered disarrangement.

The circumstances of publication may have cast a doubt upon the authorship and authority of the Gospel and contributed to its not being accepted at once outside the Apostle's immediate circle. By some of John's contemporaries, moreover, the Gospel may not have been

regarded as favourable to certain opinions that were gaining ground in the Church. As time passed, however, a different view was taken of the interpretation to be placed upon the Gospel. It having come to be regarded as orthodox, the reasoned judgment of the Church approved it on the basis of evidence of authorship most of which has since perished, and it won its way over a period of half-a-century or more to general recognition.

PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The doctrine of the Lamb slain in the divine intention from the foundation of the world (Revelation XIII, 8) permeates the whole Gospel. The Evangelist believes that the earthly career of Jesus was foreshadowed, sometimes even in matters of minute detail, in the writings of the Old Testament. We must not misapprehend the role of the prophet. Sometimes there rose before him the vision of great events to come and he realized its nature (John XII, 41), but at other times, while consciously referring to the events of his own day, he unconsciously painted a picture of the distant future. That the picture was a real one, and the resemblance between the prophecy and its fulfilment other than accidental is a view that has the authority of Jesus Himself (John V, 46). The writings of the prophets were part of the current religious coin of first-century Judaism, whence they passed into Christianity. The mind of the thoughtful Jew was full of them, and Jesus Himself loved to dwell on them (Matthew VII, 12 and elsewhere). We must not indeed exaggerate, as Burney appears to do when, writing of John VII, 37-8, he suggests that our Lord had in His mind Ezekiel XLVII, 9, Joel III, 18 and Zechariah XIV, 8, and in addition was dwelling on Isaiah LV, 1 seq. Yet in the hour of crisis, and more especially in subsequent reflection thereon, the prophetic writings would grow increasingly vivid and the appositeness of particular passages become apparent.

We must not be misled by the words "that the Scripture might be fulfilled", so frequent in the Authorized English Version of the Gospels, into supposing that our Lord in particular acted as He did, primarily if not solely, with the purpose of assuring the fulfilment of prophecy. That would give complete artificiality both to the act and to the prophecy. A key text on which to test the matter is John XIX, 28, where we find our Lord uttering from the Cross His dying cry "I thirst". Schmiedel misapprehends the significance of this cry. The scripture to which reference is here made by the Evangelist is Psalm LXIX, 21—"In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink"—and Jesus' words "I thirst" were the occasion of vinegar being offered to Him and the prophecy being fulfilled, but it is unthinkable that the words were impelled by anything but the agony of the awful thirst that comes upon the crucified. It was the eye of faith which subsequently saw the relation between the words and their sequel on the one hand and the prophecy on the other. The Evangelist was concerned merely to give a truthful picture of what happened and to interpret the happening as the Holy Spirit gave him guidance. The fulfilment of prophecy is not to be conceived of as an end in itself, nor prophecy as the cause of the events that fulfil it. The fulfilment of a prophecy brings out its inner meaning, often unperceived when it was uttered.

and is its completion but not its result. John XI, 51 makes clear that Caiaphas' doctrine of expediency was true in a sense that he did not himself suspect, and similar unconsciously prophetic words are uttered by men and women in our own day. Our own airman son, setting out on his last flight on the night of 20-21 April, 1943, said to a dear friend and fellow-airman, "I will see you in the morning". His friend was killed while flying little more than a year later. The physical meeting which they had contemplated was indeed denied to them, but no one who knew the two can doubt that, if our son is indeed dead, they met in the morning, the spiritual morning that is irradiated by God's love, and that the unconscious prophecy has been fulfilled.

In seeking to fathom the teaching of the Fourth Gospel we must bear in mind the hint by Burney and others that the little Greek words 'INA and 'OTI are not always used by the Evangelist to introduce the expression of a purpose, as they do in classical Greek. We must often give to the words rendered "that the scripture might be fulfilled" a consecutive rather than a final sense and understand them as though they read "so (or in such a way) as to fulfill the scripture"

We may endorse the verdict of Hoskyns—"Nowhere in the Johannine writings does the problem of the relation between the will of God and human freedom appear above the horizon. The Johannine language inevitably causes a controversy concerning predestination, but there is no evidence that the controversy gave rise to the Johannine language". We must however ask ourselves whether the Fourth Gospel does in fact teach a doctrine of predestination and election. Is Howard right when he says that the Gospel "pays homage to the accepted view that the divine action in this world is predetermined and does not depend upon the chances and changes of human effort"? At first sight an unqualified affirmative appears the only possible answer. Things are represented as happening so that prophecy may be fulfilled (John XII, 38 and in many other places); inability to do a thing is described as the effect of prophecy (John XII, 40); and Jesus not only knows all things that are to befall Him (John XVIII, 4) and is Himself predestined to go to the Father (John XIV, 28), but can declare of His disciples that they will be scattered and will leave Him alone (John XVI, 32). No man can come to Jesus except the Father draw him (John VI, 44) or, as it is put elsewhere, except it be given him of the Father (John VI, 65); Jesus prays for those whom the Father has given Him (John XVIII, 9); it is to them that He gives eternal life (John XVII, 2), and of them He has not lost one (John XVIII, 9).

The impression which these texts create, if taken alone, needs qualification if they are read, as they should be, in conjunction with others in the same Gospel. Inability to do a thing may appear to be represented as the result of prophecy (John XII, 40), but nevertheless many do it (John XII, 42). The declaration that no man can come to Jesus except the Father Who sent Jesus draw him (John VI, 44) must be read in the light both of what precedes and what follows. The

emphasis will then be seen to fall upon "the Father Which sent Me" and not upon the predicate and object "draw him", for this declaration follows closely upon the disparaging question "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know"? (John VI, 42) and it itself followed by a reference to a prophecy that all men shall be taught of God (John VI, 45) or in other words drawn of the Father. Further, Jesus prays not only for those whom the Father has given Him, but for those also that believe on Him through their word (John XVII, 20). It is not to be implied that the Father has not given Jesus these latter also; rather the text gives a clue to the nature of the gift referred to. The Father gives to Jesus those who believe on Him. Of these He can be regarded as not having lost one (John XVIII, 9), not even Judas, for Judas, insofar as he did not believe, was not "given".

Further evidence pointing in the same direction is supplied by John I, 9, where it is said that the true light lighteth "every" man that cometh into the world; by John I, 7, where we are told that John the Baptist bore witness that "all" might believe; and by John III, 17, which records that God sent the Son that "the world" might be saved.

On the other hand John XVII, 12 requires explanation. There Judas "the son of perdition" is counted as one of those whom God has given the Son. The fact that Judas could be left out in one place, however, carries far more weight than the fact that he is included in another. Perhaps Jesus was looking back to a time when Judas had believed. This is the mental attitude of a schoolmaster who speaks of "my boys" long after the "boys" have left school and grown up.

The election of this Gospel is therefore universal conditional election. All are drawn, and all are elected on condition that they believe. Similarly predestination will be found to be conditional. In spite of a general inability to do a thing which the Evangelist connects with ancient prophecy, many do it (John XII, 42). Even Jesus' own predestined future was conditional on His own willing obedience (John X, 18).

CHAPTER XIV.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE SACRAMENTS.

On a careful examination of the Fourth Gospel the reader can hardly fail to be impressed by the fact that it omits all reference to the Baptism of Jesus and the institution by Him of the Sacrament of Holy Communion, and further goes out of its way—in an addition to the original text—to remove a possible misunderstanding by stressing the point that Jesus Himself did not administer the rite of Baptism (John IV, 2). Rightly or wrongly Goguel argues that the incident of the dove (John I, 32) shows that the Evangelist knew of the Baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist, but it is unnecessary to weigh such an argument, The Evangelist must have known both of the Baptism of Jesus and of the institution by Him of the Sacrament of Holy Communion. Indeed, if we are right in identifying him with the Apostle John, he was probably present at the former and certainly present at the latter. This circumstance makes his silence all the more significant.

On the other hand there are passages in the Gospel which have seemed to many to have a sacramental reference and which demand our serious consideration. Thus Fr. Vincent McNabb, O. P., *From a Friar's Cell* (1923), page 85, finds reference to Holy Orders in John I (Call of the Apostles), Matrimony in John II (Marriage Feast at Cana), Baptism and Confirmation in John III (Conversation with Nicodemus), Penance in John IV (Dialogue with the Samaritan Woman), Holy Eucharist in John VI (Dialogue with the Jews) and possibly Extreme Unction in John XII, 1-8.

As a rule the passages cited are passages in which the words "water", "flesh" and "blood" occupy a prominent position, and among these we must pay very special attention to the following—

John III, 5—Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.

John VI, 53—Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves. 54. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life. 56. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me and I in him. 57. As the living Father sent Me, and I live because of the Father, so he that eateth Me shall also live because of Me. 58. He that eateth this bread shall live for ever. 63. The words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life.

John XIII, 8—If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me. 10. He that is bathed needeth not (save) to wash (his feet) but is clean every whit; and ye are clean, but not all.

John XIX, 34—One of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side, and straightway there came out blood and water.

Such an impression did these and similar passages make on the mind of Burkitt that he wrote, "I venture to think that the Fourth

Gospel is saturated with sacramentalism". Gardner puts the same point, his conclusion being that "the Fourth Evangelist regarded the Christian sacraments on their literal and ritual side as of great importance." Even Lord Charnwood writes of "the Evangelist's pervading interest in the Sacraments."

On the other hand Howard thinks that "he (the Evangelist) saw the perils of a crude literalism in the language that had come to be used about the sacraments," while Anderson Scott writes, "There is an inevitable tendency to transfer to the rite the efficiency that belongs to the faith which it expresses and confirms. The Fourth Gospel is not without indications of a tacit protest against such a development". Of Schweitzer Howard goes so far as to say "Allusions to the Sacraments are found in places where nothing but uncontrolled fancy could discover anything of the sort".

Coming now to particular passages, let us turn to John III, from which verse 5 is quoted above. Amongst others Drummond and Garvie feel that this chapter deals with the doctrine of Baptism, while Carpenter says that the allusion to Baptism in the words "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit" has been "universally recognized". Forbes, writing of the word "water" in John III, 5, says that it "denotes Baptism, which in the early Church conditioned the gift of the Spirit and therefore also admittance into the Kingdom" (Johannine Literature, 1907, page 201). Much in the same tone as Carpenter Howard says, "It is now generally recognized that it is impossible to read the discourses of the third and sixth chapters of the Gospel without finding in them a reference to the two sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist", and he adds, "The writer could not fail to know that such an interpretation must be put upon his language". This addition calls for comment. The language purports to be that of Jesus, and not that of the Evangelist, and we saw reason for so regarding it. Consequently the interpretation which the Evangelist saw must be placed upon the language used, whatever that interpretation was, has no bearing on the point at issue. His concern was merely to report the words of Jesus, and he had no authority, nor would he arrogate to himself authority, to alter those words so as to bring out what he believed to have been Jesus' meaning.

So far as the third chapter of our Gospel is concerned, the association of Jesus' words with Baptism is effected, if in fact there is such an association, by the two little words "water and" and these words seem to break the continuity of the discourse. So strongly has the incongruity of the words with the rest of the chapter been felt that the suggestion has been made that they are an interpolation. There is no mss. authority for their omission, and in the circumstances one must look upon the suggestion with suspicion. There is however no necessary association of the word "water" as here used with the sacrament of Baptism. As Hoskyns notices, there is no suggestion of baptism with water by Jesus or His disciples in the Synoptic Gospels

and, were it not for the express statement of the Fourth Gospel that the disciples did baptise (John IV, 2), we might be driven to the conjecture that Christian baptism had its origin in Jesus' great final injunction (Matthew XXVIII, 19). Even after the Ascension we meet with "one Apollos, instructed in the Christian way, who yet had not heard of Christian baptism" (Acts XVIII, 25). We must not press this too far, however. If we would grasp the inner meaning of John III, 5, we must read on in the chapter. Nicodemus expresses surprise (John III, 9), and Jesus goes on to ask "Art thou the teacher of Israel and understandest not these things"? What Jesus meant to teach then was something that Nicodemus ought to have understood. Now it is hardly credible that Nicodemus, an orthodox Jew, ought to have been aware of the fact, if it be a fact, that Christian baptism is an essential preliminary to admission to the Kingdom of God. What Nicodemus, as the teacher of Israel, might be expected to know was the Hebrew Scriptures. Through these Scriptures flowed two great streams, the legal and the prophetic, and it ought never to have been forgotten, as it was by that Pharisaic group of which Nicodemus was a member, that the two are complementary. In the literal observance of the Law the Pharisee might, as Paul claimed at a later date, walk blamelessly, but the deep spiritual teaching of the prophets remained unapprehended by him. The cleansing that water typified might be spiritual as well as ceremonial, and in its spiritual sense it was and is a necessary preliminary to a new spiritual life. It was an Old Testament writer who breathed the great prayer "Create in me a clean heart and renew a right spirit within me". The simplest explanation of the words "water and" in John III, 5 is that they refer to the cleansing of which water is typical without any necessary association with the formal rite.

Similar problems are raised by the sixth chapter of our Gospel. Whatever the "general recognition" to-day, and it takes no account of the great work of Odeberg, opinion as to the interpretation of this chapter has been sharply divided in the past, and we shall have to consider very seriously the language of the chapter before we dismiss the minority view. Gardner-Smith may say that "most critics admit that John VI contains the Fourth Evangelist's contribution to the Church's doctrine of the Eucharist", but, if so, so much the worse for the critics, for the contribution, whatever it was, is, as we have seen, that of Jesus and not of the Evangelist.

Chapter VI of the Fourth Gospel has received both a spiritual and a Eucharistic interpretation, and among those in favour of the former ranged Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Augustine, Jerome, Thomas Aquinas, Cajetan and the Calvinists, while supporters of the latter interpretation include most Roman Catholic writers of recent date, Zahn, Loisy, Bauer and Heltzmann. To Roman Catholics, however, the question is an open one, and at the Council of Trent the Eucharistic sense was approved by no greater majority than 19 votes

to 9, the mincricity being influenced apparently by the fact that such an interpretation points to the necessity of communion in both kinds. We cited Bauer as a modern advocate of the Eucharistic interpretation, and of his Odeberg, the foremost recent champion of the other view, says, "Bauer's attitude towards John may be said to be . . . that of making a low religious stratum the norm of interpretation of a very high one simply on the ground that the two happen to be connected or use resembling expressions or nomenclature." Odeberg's own comment is that "one who understands the words of the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood to refer to the bread and wine of the Eucharist takes exactly the mistaken view of which Nicodemus in chapter III and the Jews here are made the exponents, viz. that John's (let us rather say Jesus') realistic expressions refer to objects of the terrestrial world instead of to objects of the celestial world".

A crucial issue is raised by Schmiedel when he refers to "the quite remarkable fact that Jesus, about the time of the second Passover feast which occurred during His public ministry (John VI, 4) gives the disciples an explanation of the meaning of the Supper which, according to the same Gospel, He did not celebrate with them at all, and according to the Synoptics not until a year later; yet the discourses in chapter VI do not permit of the least doubt that the Supper is really alluded to" (Johannine Writings, page 98). If Schmiedel and others are right in believing that the references to "flesh and blood" are references to the bread and wine used in the Communion service, then the teaching of the chapter does appear untimely. Let us however examine the chapter itself for corroboration or contradiction of the view. On this view John VI, 53, in which it is declared that "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have not life in yourselves" must mean that participation in the Communion service is an essential condition of eternal life. This is a conclusion that is not unwelcome to certain circles, and it is not surprising that it is precisely in these circles that the Eucharistic interpretation has found the most eager acceptance and championship. We must see how far this interpretation leads us. Let us look at the next verse. "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life", carries us a step further. Not only is participation in the Communion service an essential condition of eternal life but such participation is on this view in itself sufficient to ensure eternal life. This probably goes a good deal further than most supporters of the Eucharistic interpretation would be prepared to go, but given their interpretation the conclusion appears to be inevitable. Consequently the difficulty of reconciling such a conclusion with much that we read elsewhere in the Gospel affords strong ground for doubting the accuracy of the interpretation which requires it. Moreover, it seems incredible that a writer who knew that such extreme importance was attached to the Communion service would have omitted altogether from his Gospel any mention of the institution of that service. We have a

pointer which indicates the way to the correct interpretation of the chapter in the great words of John VI, 63—"The words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life"—that is to say, are to be understood in a spiritual sense and are life-giving. A further valuable clue is furnished by a comparison of John VI, 47 and 54. John VI, 47 contains Jesus' declaration that "he that believeth hath eternal life", while the message of John VI, 54 is that "he that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life". If these two passages stood alone, they might be regarded as indicating the existence of alternative methods of entry into eternal life, the one belief and the other the eating of Jesus' flesh and the drinking of His blood. They do not stand alone, however, for John VI, 53, it will be remembered, reads "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in yourselves", and this negatives the possibility of there being alternative methods. Hence, as believing is one method of entrance, eating Jesus' flesh and drinking His blood must be the same thing as believing. By believing in Jesus as the Son of God we become partakers of the life that is in Him and is eternal—"As I live because of the Father, so he that eateth Me shall also live because of Me (John VI, 57). Flesh and blood are thus to be understood in a spiritual sense, and the key warning in John VI, 63—"The words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life" is satisfied. The flesh, taken literally, "profiteth nothing". Burch goes to the very heart of the matter when he declares, "The Bread of Life is Himself as the embodiment of the revelation of God. A man partakes of that bread as He is believed in and followed . . . When Jesus was on earth no symbol was needed" (Structure, page 128). Yet we shall do well not to ignore those two words "and followed". Belief is no mere intellectual assent—if it were, it would assuredly be barren. Real belief will impel the believer to do the will of Him in Whom it is centered, and he will not forget the touching words, uttered as it were under the very shadow of the Cross, "This do ye . . . in remembrance of Me" (I Corinthians, XI, 25).

The Fourth Gospel, it has been remarked, contains no account of the institution of the Communion service. In the place where we should expect to find such an account we are confronted by the story of the washing of the disciples' feet. This washing typifies the Atonement—something done for man—the fruit of Jesus' obedient life and not only of His victorious death, which is the supreme incident of that life. That was why Jesus had power on earth to forgive sin (Mark II, 10). The bathing is typical of the individual's part, that which has to be done by man for himself. Judas was not bathed and therefore was not clean because he had not done his part, i. e. did not believe. It may be that none of the disciples had received Christian baptism (for Jesus "baptised not"—John IV, 2), though some of them had no doubt received John the Baptist's baptism. If they had received Christian baptism, Judas had no doubt been baptised as well

as the others. This is fatal to any attempt to explain the incident on the analogy of Baptism and Confirmation. The idea of relative magnitude—that it was a greater thing to bathe than to wash the feet—may not have been present in the mind of Jesus, but to the individual his part is the important thing. Besides Jesus had to bring in the idea of service as well as that of atonement—He had two lessons to teach.

Two other parts of the Fourth Gospel to which it has been sought to give a sacramental connotation call for brief notice. From John XIX, 34 we learn that, when a spear was thrust into Jesus' side, there came forth "blood and water." In these elements some have seen a typification of Baptism and Holy Communion. The order of the words is fatal to this view—had it been correct, we should assuredly have heard of "water and blood", as Baptism normally precedes participation in the Communion service.

Finally, in John XXI, 9 we read that "as soon as they were come to land, they saw a fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread". This has been regarded as typical of the spiritual nourishment that Jesus provides for the believer in Holy Communion, but the analogy is fanciful. As Hoskyns remarks, there is no evidence that fish ever formed the matter of the sacrament.

The Fourth Gospel is indeed singularly bare of sacramental allusions, but we must not misunderstand the Evangelist and attribute to him an anti-sacramentalism that was not his. He had very good reasons of his own for omitting this and including that. The fact that an event—even an important event—had already been narrated elsewhere may sometimes have influenced him in favour of its exclusion from his own narrative. One other factor that helped to shape the Fourth Gospel must however on no account be overlooked. The period when that Gospel received its final shape, somewhere about the end of the first century A. D., was one in which sacramental ideas received a great development, as we may perceive, among other places, in the writings of Ignatius. In Christian circles it was claimed that this development had its starting point in the teaching and practice of Jesus. The author of the Fourth Gospel does not himself argue for any view. It would be a complete mistake to regard him as an anti-sacramentalist because his Gospel does not dwell on the sacraments of the Church. One might as reasonably argue that the millions upon millions who have found a satisfying expression of their belief in the Apostles' Creed did not believe in the redemptive value of the death on the Cross. What the Evangelist wished was that the Church should have before it as a guide a trustworthy record of certain words and acts of Jesus, and this was what he left to posterity. The Evangelist indeed took no side, but, if the interpretations of the Gospel suggested in this book are near the truth, men like Ignatius may well have perceived the negative nature of the support which the Gospel gave to their ideas, and this would

not have tended to make the Gospel and its author very popular with them. This may account for the paucity of possible quotations in the works of early Christian writers, so far as they have come down to us, and for less, and less definite, mention of the Evangelist than would otherwise have been the case. The Gospel is however in no sense a polemical treatise and, as time passed, men began to give it a new interpretation that made it the sheet-anchor of orthodoxy. From that time forth its position in the Christian world was assured.

CHAPTER XV.

THE SONS OF ZEBEDEE AND THEIR DESIRE FOR PRE-EMINENCE.

In an earlier portion of this book we discussed the question whether certain incidents recorded in the Synoptic Gospels do not create a presumption that John, son of Zebedee, was a man of such character as to make it unlikely that he was the author of the Fourth Gospel. One of these incidents was that recorded in Mark X, 32-45, where we find the sons of Zebedee making the request, "Grant unto us that we may sit, one on Thy right hand, and the other on Thy left hand, in Thy Glory." This incident is further discussed in the following pages.

The request of the sons of Zebedee is one that impresses as we read and afterwards lingers in the memory. Yet, if we are to appreciate its implications aright, we must be careful not to separate it from the context in which the Synoptic Gospels place it. Let us try for a moment to picture to ourselves the circumstances in which it was made. The earthly ministry of Jesus has almost reached its close. The period of physical contact between master and disciples is all but over. Jesus has indeed appealed to the masses with those gems of picturesque narrative, His beautiful parables, but all the while He has been giving deeper teaching to the little group of intimates chosen by Him to be leaders in the cause after He has gone. How far has He succeeded? Have these picked men assimilated His ideas and His teaching? The seed has been sown—is there any sign of a harvest? These may well seem to be crucial questions on the answers to which depends the future success or failure of the cause. What are the answers?

Jesus has chosen from among His followers twelve men for intensive instruction, and from among these twelve three—Peter, James and John—seem to have been admitted to a closer personal contact than the others. Here if anywhere the fruit of His teaching should be apparent. Two of these three men speak. The circumstances are full of pathos. The little band is on the way going up to Jerusalem. Jesus is at its head. He has just declared in clear and moving terms what for Him lies at the end of the journey. Rejection, condemnation, mockery, scourging and death await Him. Here surely is a situation that should call forth the best that is in these men on whose instruction He has spent so much of His earthly strength. James and John have something to say. Is it some declaration of devotion to Him and His cause that will spring to their lips?

With what a sense of disappointment one would read on if one anticipated any such thing. The mode of approach is in itself sufficient to excite suspicion. The words used—"We would that Thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall ask Thee"—suggest that

James and John must have felt that it was at least doubtful whether Jesus would grant the desired boon if it were openly demanded, and that they wished to obtain from Him a pledge that He would grant it before He knew its nature. As we know from the Bible itself, there was a contemporary of Jesus who gave such a pledge and spilled innocent blood in order to redeem it (Mark VI, 21-28), but the wisdom of God that was in Jesus never moves blindly. Before Jesus can grant their request, even to these loved associates, He must know whether it is a right one. "What would ye that I should do for you"? comes His question, and now the desire of their hearts is disclosed. "Grant unto us that we may sit, one on Thy right hand and one on Thy left hand, in Thy glory". Here is the request—just what does it mean?

If the words stood alone, it would be possible to read into them a spiritual interpretation. We might imagine that these men knew what communion with Jesus was and could not bear to think that, when He had passed into the Beyond and they were left behind, that communion would be interrupted. That would be a comforting view and, if it were true, Jesus must have found welcome encouragement in what was said. One would like to believe that it is the true view, but the context forbids. Jesus' subsequent reference to the Kings of the Gentiles lording it over them leaves no room for doubt that it was authority, and not communion, that James and John sought.

The request then failed, not because it was personal, but because the wrong goal was aimed at. Here to all appearance was evidence that the seed sown by Jesus had fallen on unproductive soil and that even these bosom-companions of His had failed to understand. Yet how gentle was Jesus' rebuke! No note of indignation is heard, but instead words of patient explanation. "Ye know not what ye ask". How are we to explain these words? Surely it was only too painfully clear that James and John did know what they had asked, and that they had asked the wrong thing. In one sense yes, but what they did not know was that the places they sought were not to be disposed of by favour and that the way to win them was the exact opposite of that which they had followed.

"Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink and to be baptised with the baptism wherewith I am baptised"? What cup? What baptism? What ideas are typified? Are there indeed two ideas or only one? We know that Hebrew thought tended to double back on itself and to repeat the same thing in a slightly different form. The Psalms are full of these figures of speech. They were the Hebrew hymn-book, used in public worship and resorted to in private meditation, and Jesus was a Hebrew. At least we are spared the identification of the cup with the Communion service. Even those who are most ready to read sacramental allusions into the Gospels have not gone to the extent of suggesting that the test demanded of the Sons of Zebedee was their ability to participate in a ceremony that was not yet instituted. There is indeed widespread agreement that Jesus

was here alluding to the forthcoming Death on the Cross, but, if so, was He questioning James and John simply and solely as to their readiness to suffer death by martyrdom in His cause, or was the requirement something more? The difficulty in the way of supposing that the former was the case lies in the fact that in response to their eager declaration of "ability"—whatever exactly that may signify—Jesus declares that they shall drink the cup and be baptised with the baptism that are His. While James certainly died a martyr's death, we saw reason for rejecting the suggestion of the critics that John also suffered death by martyrdom. Are we then to assume that Jesus' prediction was not fulfilled in the case of John? It may be merely that we have not interpreted Jesus' prediction aright. What cup was it that Jesus had to drink? It is remarkable how intimately the idea of the cup is associated with that of death. Socrates and his cup of hemlock are familiar to us, and we know that potions intended to numb the senses were often administered to persons condemned to suffer the extreme penalty. No doubt the Crucifixion was part either of the cup that Jesus had to drink or of the baptism wherewith He was to be baptised, but we may be sure that the Crucifixion was not the sole ingredient of Jesus' cup nor the whole of the Baptism to which He alluded. Quite apart from the death on the Cross He was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. He had to bear not only the burden of effort and privation, but the scorn, the persecution and the rejection of men, and that rejection of Himself and His message must have imposed upon Him an agony of mind proportionate to His love for men and the eagerness of His desire to win them. Jesus then, it would seem, wanted to know from James and John whether they were willing to suffer for His cause, and His prediction had no necessary connection with the manner of their death. Yet the form of enquiry and answer alike is peculiar. "Are ye able"? "We are able". Why "able"? Surely because the refusal of Jesus' offer of salvation by our fellow-men can pain us only insofar as we love our fellow-men. What Jesus asks of James and John is this—Are ye able to love so much that ye yourselves suffer because of your love?

There remains the question whether cup and baptism are here identical. Matthew's version of Jesus' question, from which the reference to baptism is absent in some of the best manuscripts, may indicate that the author of the First Gospel so regarded them, but there may nevertheless be a shade of difference. One may drain a cup in solitude, but baptism demands the co-operation of another. Baptism may here well typify the suffering that is the effect of the action of others deliberately directed against ourselves, while the cup lays special emphasis upon that often far acuter suffering that is unconsciously produced by them.

"We are able". This reply illustrates the brighter side of these men's nature. They are at least willing to pay the price. It should be observed too that they are not worse in their ambition than their

fellow-disciples, for their request would hardly have aroused indignation in the latter unless they had coveted for themselves the pre-eminence desired by James and John. It is no excuse for a man that he is not worse than his fellows, but the question does present itself whether it is fair to James and John to associate the idea of ambition with them to the exclusion of their fellows. One of the difficulties that has been felt with regard to the Fourth Gospel is that of identifying the man of spiritual insight who was its author with the very different disciple of the name of John portrayed by the Synoptists. Evidence of a development in the character of John, son of Zebedee, is however afforded by the Synoptic Gospels themselves. Of these Mark is by common consent the earliest, while the majority view seems to be that Matthew precedes Luke. Now the accounts of this incident given by Mark and Matthew respectively differ in important particulars, while Luke gives no account at all. In Mark the request to Jesus is made directly by the sons of Zebedee. In Matthew it is their mother who makes the request. The explanation may be that, in accordance with a well-known legal maxim, what one does through another is deemed to be one's own action. If this is the right explanation, and James and John induced their mother to say for them what they had not the courage to say for themselves, they will not have been the first nor the last to do such a thing. Yet the text of Matthew is not easy to reconcile with the suggestion that it was the mother of Zebedee's sons who opened the discussion. Would she have been present at the time? It may be therefore that we have inverted the application of the legal maxim just mentioned, and that it was in fact the mother who inspired the request.

If we now turn to Luke's Gospel we shall find that all mention of such a request, either by the sons of Zebedee or by their mother, has disappeared. The process in order of time is this. First, the sons of Zebedee fill the canvas; then they recede into the background, as their mother comes into prominence; and finally the story itself disappears. With the lapse of time, it would seem, it became increasingly difficult to associate the gentle saint who became the Fourth Evangelist with the fiery contender for pre-eminence of the earlier story, and so, from a conviction that the story gave a wrong emphasis to the facts, it was first altered and then omitted. It was only in appearance that the seed sown by Jesus had fallen on unfertile soil—in the course of the years it bore its harvest.

Now the teaching of the story is not merely negative. On what principle is priority in the Kingdom awarded? Is it in accordance with predestination? From the explicit declaration of Jesus that the place of honour is not His to give, but must go to them for whom it is prepared, we might imply this. Once more, however, the context saves us from a wrong conclusion. If Jesus could rightly have done so, it can hardly be doubted that He would have given the place of honour to the beloved disciple, the man in whom He saw not only

what he was, but what he might be, and did indeed become. He could not, because in the Kingdom of Heaven there is no favoritism. It is not a question of right of disposal as between the Father and Jesus, as Matthew's Gospel might seem to suggest. No, the post of honour cannot be given by favour because those that are to have it must fit themselves. It is for those that fit themselves that it is reserved, and Jesus clearly indicates the principles on which it will be awarded. The test is service—it is readiness to serve that alone can support a claim. The strength of the claim will vary with the degree of readiness to serve until it reaches its height in him who is willing to be not merely a servant but the bondservant of all, a willingness of which the supreme example is He who lived among men as He that serveth. The Son of Man we are told in the passage which closes Mark's account of the incident came not to be ministered to but to minister, and His life of service culminated in the greatest service of all when with calm deliberation He gave that life for man's redemption. Yet it is only in a sense that He gave that life, for the life that is in Him goes on for ever.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE EPISTLES OF JOHN CONSIDERED WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THEIR RELATION TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Though printed far apart from it in our Bible, the three Epistles of John were in all probability covering notes issued with the Fourth Gospel. They are likely to have been written in the order in which we have them. The First Epistle is a general introduction to the Gospel; the Second is addressed to a particular Church—"the elect Lady and her children"—which would be the Church for which the Gospel was intended in the first instance; and the Third is addressed to an individual member of that Church. The Third Epistle contains what appears to be an allusion to the Second, and both the Second and Third reveal the existence of a state of dissension in the Church.

The attribution of the Epistles to the Apostle John has been challenged on several grounds. In the first place it is pointed out that the Second and Third Epistles describe their author as "the Elder", and it is suggested that "Elder" and "Apostle" are mutually exclusive terms. "The Elder" may however have been a title of honour given to the Apostle John in much the same way as the late Mr. Gladstone was called "the Grand Old Man". In the first century A. D., moreover, ecclesiastical terms had not yet acquired the fixity which they attained at a later date, and it may quite well be that one and the same person might have been described at one time as an Elder and at another as an Apostle. This question has already been discussed. In the second place there are differences of vocabulary between the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles which, it is said, cannot be accounted for except on the hypothesis that they were written by different persons. This plea does not allow sufficiently for the extent to which in the Gospel the author is quoting the words of Jesus, while in the Epistles he is throughout using his own, nor for the fact that the Gospel was the slow growth of more than half-a-century, while the Epistles were probably written in the course of a few sittings. A test comparison between the vocabularies of two Essays of Lord Macaulay has convinced the present writer of the danger of attaching too much weight to differences of vocabulary. Thirdly, it is suggested that there is some difference between the theological ideas of the Gospel and those of the Epistles. The reader is however more likely to be impressed by the points of agreement. The opening words of the First Epistle, expressive of the pre-existence of the Word—"That which was from the beginning"—are an echo of the opening of the Fourth Gospel—"In the beginning was the Word." Other features common to Gospel and Epistles are the author's insistence on his standing as an eye-witness, the claim that Jesus is the only means of access to God, the declaration that "no man hath seen God at any time", and the emphasis on love, an emphasis which has no parallel in any other book of the New Testament.

What was the author's object in writing? Seven objects must be mentioned, of which two are special to the First Epistle or general introduction and five—expressly stated by the author himself in the First Epistle—appear to be common to it and the Fourth Gospel.

In all probability the author wrote the First Epistle partly to underline by way of emphasis certain points in the Gospel to which he attached special importance, and partly for the quite different reason that he wished to guard against possible misunderstanding of the Gospel. In another part of the present work (Chapter XIII), an attempt has been made to elucidate the problem of the divine election on the basis of the relevant passages in the Fourth Gospel. It does seem more consonant with the divine nature as revealed to us in Jesus to suppose that the benefits of Jesus' sacrifice are available for all in a real sense, but there are certainly many Biblical passages that appear at first sight to point in an opposite direction, and these are not infrequent in the Fourth Gospel. What if John perceived that men might misapprehend? If this suggestion be accepted, then we shall at once see the great words "And He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world" in a fresh light. They are not a contradiction of anything in the Gospel, but an interpretation. The disciple whom Jesus loved, the man who was privileged to see more clearly than any other into the mysteries of God, is revealing to us the real purpose of his Lord as he learned it from the Master.

Five further reasons for writing, and these apparently common to Gospel and Epistle, are disclosed in the First Epistle. Some of them are nearly akin to others. The first was to unite—"That ye also may have fellowship with us". The second was to satisfy the need of the author's own heart—"That our joy may be fulfilled". He felt that he had something which he must share with his fellow-men and that his joy would be incomplete unless he shared it. As pointed out in the margin of the Revised English version, many ancient manuscripts read "That YOUR joy may be fulfilled". Probably "our" is the correct reading and "your" due to assimilation to another passage, but "your" would have appealed to the author as well as "our". No man's joy can be full until he knows Jesus. The third motive was to improve—"That ye may not sin". Fourthly, John wrote as he did because his immediate audience was mainly composed of people who were already believers on Jesus. To them he wrote "because they knew the truth". In spite of its apparent simplicity there is strong meat in the Fourth Gospel. A last motive was to assure—"That ye may know that ye have eternal life". This motive must underlie the composition of both Gospel and Epistles, for John would never have had the arrogance to confirm the Master's words by any declaration of his own. The part of the Fourth Evangelist was not that of one who evolved new ideas by his own mental processes but that of a mirror accurately reflecting the innermost recesses of the mind of Jesus.

It is only when we have grasped this that we are able to estimate the importance attaching to the next question for our consideration. What is it that God, according to John, demands of men? The answer is to be found in I John III, 23. God demands both affirmation and action. On the one hand we must accept Jesus as the Son of God, and on the other we must love our fellows as He loved us. To love involves both obedience to His commandment and the imitation of His example. It admits to that relationship with God which John describes in his First Epistle as "fellowship". Thus the old Jewish idea that the Law must be obeyed is retained, but it is a new law, a law of liberty, liberty to give the best that is in us.

Another great question on which we may look to the First Epistle of John for guidance is that concerning the purpose for which Jesus came to earth. John gives four reasons. In the first place Jesus came to enlighten. This was in the main the work of His life, as distinct from His death—and we should notice that the First Epistle as well as the Gospel, correlates light and life—but the death on the Cross is also part of the work of enlightenment. Without it we should never have realized the full extent of Jesus' love. The second purpose was to propitiate, that is to make favourable, and this must mean to propitiate God. Those early writers who suggested that Jesus' sacrifice was offered to the Devil must have been wrong. A third purpose was to cleanse men from sin, and here John insists on the universality of sin. Jesus may have been content to reply to the self-satisfied "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance", but John carries us a step further. To profess that we have no need of cleansing is to profess what is not true, at the best to deceive ourselves. Finally, Jesus was manifested to destroy the works of the Devil, and this is very nearly akin to the third purpose, for the great work of the Devil has been wrought on the human character. This thought leads us on to John's vision of the future, a vision of resplendent beauty. He does not minimize the gravity of sin, indeed he expressly warns us that there is a sin unto death, doubtless the unforgiveable sin referred to by Jesus, but he feels that with those who have entered into fellowship with God sinlessness ought to be normal. How is it that the attainment of this ideal still seems to us to lie in the dim and distant future? Is it because our aim has not been high enough, our faith in God strong enough? John not only anticipates the attainment of sinlessness in this present life; he sees a vision of the believer standing unashamed in the presence of God when this life is past. He will be unashamed because he is justified, that is declared righteous, as Jesus is, and he can be declared righteous because he abides in Jesus and there has been shed for him the blood poured out on Calvary.

This is the bright side of the picture, but John is not unaware that there is also a dark side. He sees in the field foes that are both insistent and powerful. These foes he deals with under the four heads of false doctrine, hate, the world and the Devil. The

Devil is the personification of the forces of evil and represents evil in general rather than any particular form of evil, but false doctrine, hate and the world each demand separate consideration.

Firstly, as to false doctrine, how are we to distinguish the false from the true? John has a simple test. He that is with us is right, and he that is against us is wrong. At first sight this appears perfectly egotistic. Properly understood, however, it has nothing of egotism in it. The case is indeed exactly the same as that of Paul, who, after making the most sweeping personal claims, brings us in a moment into the divine presence with the great words "Nevertheless not I, but Christ Who dwelleth in me". John claims indeed that we are right and that those who differ from us are wrong, but our doctrine is right, not because it is ours, but because it is the doctrine which we have learned of Jesus. It is His authority, not ours, that sustains the claim.

The second foe is hate. It stands at the opposite pole from love, and its presence in the human heart is a fatal bar to the development of character. Hate, though John does not point the fact out, warps and withers both physically and spiritually. The best way to exclude hate is to leave no room for it by filling the heart with its opposite, love.

Hate is the normal attitude of the world towards them that love Jesus, and this brings us to the consideration of the third foe, the world. The characteristics of the world are that it is material, physical and transitory. These things must never be put first. Between Jesus and the world the individual must choose. He cannot serve in both camps. The Highest demands his utmost.

In reading the First Epistle one can hardly fail to be impressed by the sudden transition of thought which marks the closing words. After dealing with wholly dissociated ideas the writer breaks into the great injunction "Little children, keep yourselves from idols" and, having given it, he abruptly lays down his pen. Their isolation in point of logical sequence and their position give these words a tremendous emphasis, and this emphasis may be regarded as a deliberate master stroke on the part of one who looked with the vision of the seer into the future and foresaw the danger that would confront the Church. No doubt the immediate reference is to image worship, but we must not delude ourselves into the belief that the warning has no other application. There may be idols of the heart as well as of the sanctuary, some dear one loved to the exclusion of our love for Jesus, or else perchance knowledge or art desired as an end in itself. If so, the Christian must be an iconoclast. He must cast the false valuation from its pedestal to the ground.

"The dearest idol I have known,
Whate'er that idol be,
Help me tear it from Thy throne
And worship only Thee".

CHAPTER XVII.

JESUS AS THE TRUE VINE (John XV)

We have noticed in the course of our enquiry that the Fourth Gospel sometimes emphasizes sides of Jesus' life and ministry about which the Synoptic Gospels say comparatively little, and in particular that it dwells upon the importance which He attached to His personal claims. One of the most impressive features of the Fourth Gospel is the series of passages commonly known as "The Sevenfold I am" but really eight in number if we include, as we should, "Before Abraham was I am", which Schmiedel thought senseless, but which is clearly an endorsement from the lips of Jesus of the doctrine of pre-existence expressed by the Evangelist in the Prologue to the Gospel and should be understood as meaning "I am. He that existed before Abraham". The present chapter discusses one of these affirmations—"I am the true Vine".

For His illustrations Jesus looked to contemporary history or to His physical surroundings. The fall of the Tower at Siloam with its indiscriminate slaughter of the just and the unjust (Luke XIII, 4) and Pilate's massacre of Galileans while they were engaged in the very act of sacrifice (Luke XIII, 1-2) furnished Him with texts on the one hand, but equally He drew the lessons He had to teach from the lilies of the field which toil not, neither do they spin (Luke XII, 27) and the sparrows for whom our Heavenly Father cares in spite of their apparent worthlessness (Matthew X, 29 seq.).

Palestine had long been famous for its vineyards. As evidence of the richness of the land Joshua, Caleb and their companions had brought a cluster of grapes to the nomadic forefathers of the Jewish race (Numbers, XIII, 23). Centuries later it was a vineyard that kindled Ahab's cupidity and led to the ruin of the innocent Naboth (I Kings XXI, 1 seq.). One of the readiest forms of ravage open to an invader was the destruction of the vineyards, and the Holy Land had often been invaded in the course of her history, but time quickly obliterates the scars of war. Moreover in our Lord's days the Roman occupation had brought with it a prolonged period of peace and material prosperity. As Jesus looked out from Jerusalem on the country around, His eyes could hardly fail to light on the vine-covered slopes that encircled the city, and it is not surprising that He should have used the vine as a figure to illustrate His teaching.

If we would not misunderstand the so-called parable of the Vine in the fifteenth chapter of the Fourth Gospel, we must beware of reading into it meanings that were not present in the mind of Jesus, and it is just here that our previous enquiry into the nature of the Gospel will be of service

In the first place we must not look upon the "parable" as a sermon

directed against ecclesiastical schism. That was a thing that had not arisen in the days of His flesh and, while we must not assume that Jesus would not have warned His followers against future dangers, He would surely have taken pains to make clear to them what He was doing. As Howard remarks, "the unity of the Church" (in the "parable") "is that not of an organization but of organic life". One of the difficulties that beset us in the discussion of matters pertaining to the Church is that it may be conceived of as a visible organization or as the whole body of believers in the Lord Jesus, organized or unorganized, and it is easy to pass from one sense to the other without giving due warning. Our "parable" does not use the word "Church," but it is apparent that, insofar as the expression is appropriate, it refers to the Church in the sense of the whole body of believers. He who would argue in favour of the reunion of the Christian churches in a single organized body must look elsewhere for his ammunition. A further timely warning is given by Burch when, speaking of the "parable", he says "These words of Jesus are not an Eucharistic extension of a Saying preserved in the other Gospels that He would not drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom came (Structure, page 156).

Before passing to a detailed consideration of the "parable", we should note the remarkable confirmation given by Luke VI, 43-44, to the fact that Jesus really did speak thus. These verses, which reproduce in an abbreviated form much of the teaching of the "parable", read as follows—

"For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. For every tree is known by his own fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes".

Reiteration of a few simple ideas is a feature of Jesus' teaching, both in the Synoptics and in the Fourth Gospel, and in Luke VI and John XV we have the same order of ideas presented in slightly different forms. Let us now turn to the "parable" and try to elucidate its message.

When Jesus declares that He is the true vine (John XV, 1) He means that in Him the quality of fruitfulness, which is characteristic of the vine, attains its fullest development. The relationship between Jesus and believers on Him is conceived of as that between a vine and its branches. "I am the vine, ye are the branches"—John XV, 5. The husbandman is God the Father, Whose work in this connection is described as one of cleansing, and the means of cleansing is the Word of God, either spoken by Jesus and now recorded for us in Holy Scripture—"the word which I have spoken unto you"—or issuing from the Spirit, Who beareth witness of Jesus. The sap of the vine is love.

We must not of course identify one aspect of the truth with the whole truth. The figure of the vine typifies one aspect of the truth, but only one aspect. Here Jesus is concerned, not with the pro-

longation of existence, but with the use to which we put existence. "Tis weary waiting here" runs a line of a familiar hymn, but Jesus would answer "Why wait?" It is the duty of the Christian to bear fruit, and the time and place for doing so are now and here. That Jesus is thinking of fruitfulness here is underlined when He goes on to speak of the world's hate, for the world is a foe that will not trouble beyond the grave. Yet, though Jesus is thinking of fruitfulness here, there is a note of futurity in true fruitfulness. The fruit of the Christian will abide, and this it will do in two ways. No generous action, no kindly thought but may wing its way down the ages and influence posterity long after the doer or thinker has passed to his reward. Moreover, the Christian will take with him into the Hereafter that developed character which is the crown of fruitfulness.

The dominant note of the "parable" is one of encouragement, but at the same time it affords solid ground for the exercise of a welcome humility. This is so in two ways. In the first place the Christian is told that he can be fruitful only in dependence. "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, so neither can ye except ye abide in Me". Pride and self-will must go. He who would love to choose his path must be content to be a follower and, while it is an easy step from "All of self and none of Thee" to "Some of self and some of Thee", "None of self and all of Thee" does seem so hard. The Christian must remember that it is better to be a doorkeeper in the House of the Lord than to dwell in the tents of the ungodly. Then a further ground for humility is to be discovered in the fact that the plan whereby the Christian may be fruitful is none of his. "Ye did not choose Me" says Jesus "but I chose you". Human intelligence can harness the forces of Niagara, or evolve an atomic bomb, but in the last resort it is dependent on a power beyond its own.

Yet even in his dependence the Christian has reason for rejoicing. Firstly, his fruitfulness glorifies God. "Herein is My Father glorified that ye bear much fruit". In the vast universe of "circling planets singing on their way" man seems such an infinitely small thing, but even in his smallness he can glorify his Father which is in Heaven. Secondly, the Christian is a friend of Jesus. "No longer do I call you servants, but I have called you friends". The plan whereby the Christian may be fruitful is indeed none of his, but he knows it. "All things that I heard from My Father" says Jesus, "I have made known to you". Thirdly, Christian fruitfulness is an increasing fruitfulness and, though Jesus does not here expressly say so, we may rest assured that it is increasing both in quantity and in quality. The finest services demand for their performance a long course of preparation, and the Christian will be faithful in great things only if he has first learned to be faithful in small things.

Several miscellaneous points arise out of the "parable". The first is its bearing on the question of everlasting punishment. Probably in the last resort we must be content with the thought that God will do right, but still the subject does exercise a strange fascination. As a mere statement of fact it must be said that the majority of Christians throughout the ages have accepted the doctrine of everlasting punishment, but the man whose heart overflows with love for his fellows can never be wholly content with such a doctrine. He may be driven to it, but, if he is, it will be with real pain. He feels that for him even the joy of Heaven would be tinged with sorrow if millions of his fellow-creatures were left to burn in everlasting fire. The bearing of the "parable" of the vine on the subject is incidental only, but even its incidental reference does seem to furnish a ray of hope. The branch which, whether on tree or ground, was equally unfruitful, is indeed burned with fire, but we should notice the transformation it effects. The useless branch is converted into the useful ash, and in this form it fertilizes the soil, and at last makes its contribution to the common fruitfulness. Who knows whether the ultimate purpose even of the fires of Hell may not be reformative as well as retributive?

Passing from this painful topic, the reader must not overlook the implied consequence of the common dependence of the branches on the parent stock. This common dependence gives to the branches a unity in diversity. In Jesus all are one. How foreign then to the mind of Jesus are the petty jealousies that disfigure so much of what claims to be Christian life. Though each should seek to bear fruit to the utmost of his ability, there must be no rivalry in fruitfulness, and each should rejoice in a brother's fruit equally with his own.

The "parable" and its sequel attain their real climax not in the idea of fruitfulness, however important that may be, but in the idea of overwhelming power which is contained in the promise "If ye abide in Me and My words abide in you, ask whatsoever ye will and it shall be done unto you". Inevitably the question arises in the mind "How can these things be?" Surely God knows what is best for us and will not do what is worse even at the request of the spiritually-minded. It is indeed probable that sometimes God does give us things we desire very much for the purpose of showing us that they are not really good for us, but that is not the idea here. The supreme fruit of spiritual development is the complete identification of our will with the will of God. The greatest petition of the Lord's Prayer is this "Thy Kingdom come. Thy will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven". In his hour of adversity the Christian may cry "Father, if it be Thy will, let this cup pass from me", but he will add with Jesus "Nevertheless not my will but Thine be done". When we have attained to this identity of our will with the will of God, then we shall ask the things that God wills and God will do what we ask because it is His will. Then in the radiance of that full unity we may go forward calmly and confidently to face the unknown future.

CHAPTER XVIII.

JESUS AS THE GOOD SHEPHERD AND THE DOOR (John X).

The so-called Parable of the Good Shepherd is one of the most frequently-read sections of the Fourth Gospel. Its imagery appeals particularly to the child mind, and many of us committed it to memory as children, but though, like so much else in this Gospel, it appears at first sight to be simple, it is found on examination to raise difficult problems.

In order that we may have the facts fully before us, let us try to reproduce the picture that was in the mind of Jesus. There are sheep in a fold; the fold has a door; there is a doorkeeper; the doorkeeper opens to the shepherd; the shepherd enters by the door; He leads out all His own sheep to pasture; thieves and robbers enter otherwise than by the door. We are told that Jesus is both the shepherd and the door.

What are the problems? They turn on the identification of the persons and places mentioned and on the explanation of the dual role of Jesus. Firstly, who are the sheep? The clue to the answer to this question is to be found in John X, 28, where Jesus declares that He gives eternal life to His own sheep. To whom does Jesus give eternal life? Surely to the men and women who believe on Him. It is not surprising that the many who see in John I, 11 an allusion to the Jewish people should detect them here also. This view is implied by Drummond when he says—"He (Jesus) had other sheep who were not of the Jewish fold, and these He was to bring so that there should be one flock". The identification of "His own sheep" with believers of the Jewish race and His "other sheep" with Gentile Christians is not however essential to the understanding of the "parable" and may even place the teaching of Jesus in a false light. For the moment let us be content to see in the sheep ordinary men and women and in His own sheep men and women who are believers.

These men and women, or those of them with whom we are immediately concerned, are in a fold. What is this fold? The popular view is that the fold is the Christian Church, generally conceived of as the organization of the orthodox, and that the "parable" is a "parable" of Christian reunion. The latter opinion however involves an anachronism—the body of Christians had not yet split up into separate sections. It is relevant to note in this connection that the true reading of John X, 16 is "There shall be one flock and one shepherd" and not "There shall be one fold and one shepherd". The former opinion—that the fold is the Christian Church—founders on the rock of John X, 3—"And He calleth His own sheep by name and leadeth them out". Jesus does not lead His sheep out of His Church and, though He might lead them from one branch of the Church to another, this cannot be the meaning here. We should note that, when Jesus leads His sheep out of the fold, He leads them out to pasture. The

most probable interpretation surely is that the fold is the sphere of man's every-day life in the world and that he is led out of it to spiritual refreshment (pasture) and back to duty. He must go back to duty for, although eternal life begins here and now, we cannot live in contemplation alone.

The fold has a door, and we are told that Jesus is both the good shepherd (John X, 11) and the door (John X, 7). We need not be surprised that Jesus should speak of Himself under the figure of the shepherd. Shepherds were too familiar a feature of Palestinian life for Him to have failed to avail Himself of the ready illustration. There is evidence in the Synoptics that He did avail Himself of it—see for example Mark XIV, 27. Burch remarks that He was enrobing Himself with a title traditionally given to the God of Israel (Structure, page 92). The dual identification of Jesus as shepherd and door has been the subject of much conjecture, some of it in quite unexpected quarters. Thus Lagrange says "One might have suspected that Jesus was representing Himself as the shepherd; but who would have thought that He was the door?" Garvie is similarly puzzled and asks "Would not Jesus have confused His hearers by passing from the simile of the shepherd to that of the door?" while Schmiedel is more dogmatic and, after putting the question "Who can think of Jesus as the door?" goes on to declare "How Jesus can here represent the door cannot be made clear." Perhaps it could not—by Schmiedel—but in any event the question is how the door represents Jesus and not vice versa. Some have tried to find a solution of the difficulty by the bold expedient of excising John X, 7-10 and assigning it to a different occasion. It is always tempting to assume that difficult passages owe their difficulty to interpolation, but this is an assumption that should only be made in the light of manuscript evidence and after all possible alternatives have been thoroughly explored. In the present case we need not look far. Man enters in by Jesus, but Jesus enters in by Himself. The doorkeeper knows Him, and He need plead no merit, no right but His own. The figure of the door, strange as it is, typifies the difference between Jesus and the believer. Its striking form is intended to arrest and focus our attention.

Who then is the doorkeeper, sometimes miscalled "the porter"? Carpenter can say "In the situation attributed to Jesus there was no community of believers at Jerusalem, still less in His living presence was a doorkeeper needed". The first statement is incorrect, and the second argues a complete failure to grasp an essential part of the Gospel message. There is One greater than Jesus Himself (John XIV, 28), One to Whom Jesus made atonement for sin (Romans V, 10). That One is God the Father, and it is He Who is here represented under the figure of the doorkeeper.

The prime adversary of doorkeeper and shepherd alike is the Wolf, His evil nature is emphasized, and there is no difficulty in recognizing in him Satan or, as Odeberg puts it, "the ruler of this world". We must distinguish between the Wolf and the hireling. The

latter has no evil intentions towards the flock but seeks some kind of reward, e. g. fame, and "careth not for the sheep" (John X, 13). The hireling is introduced to bring out by contrast the nature of Jesus. Once more in the words of Odeberg "the word 'hireling' here merely has a negative purpose. Jesus is no hireling".

There is yet another group to be considered before we leave this question of identification. In John X, 8 Jesus declares "All that ever came before Me were thieves and robbers", and Carpenter thought that this was "one of the dark passages of the Gospel, implying at first sight a denial of the apparent historic dependence of Christianity on Judaism". According to Zahn the thieves and robbers are the princes of the House of Herod and even the Asmoneans, Judas the Galilean, the Zealots and so on. We must however beware of giving to the word "all" in John X, 8 too narrow or too extended a meaning. On the one hand we must not limit it to the leaders or misleaders of Judaism. The gaze of Jesus was fixed on a wider field and embraced all those who had led men astray in every land and in every age. On the other hand we must not read the little word "all" as admitting of no exception. That it did admit of exceptions is proved by the analogy of such passages as John III, 32-33. The slightest consideration ought to convince one that Jesus cannot have intended to stigmatise Moses and the Hebrew prophets, who in a chronological sense "came before" Him. As Odeberg saw, "the Fore-runners" of whom Jesus spoke "belong to that class of men who have FALSELY claimed to possess knowledge and vision of the divine world and to be able to teach and lead others".

There are important lessons to be learned from the "parable" and the following may be mentioned. Jesus' leadership involves martyrdom—"The good shepherd giveth His life for the sheep" (John X, 11). Then the end is conceived of as salvation and not, as in the "parable" of the Vine as fruitfulness, though the two ideas are of course complementary and not mutually exclusive. Finally we should note that Jesus as the good shepherd knows and is known of His own (John X, 14).

CHAPTER XIX.

JESUS AS THE WAY, THE TRUTH AND THE LIFE (John XIV).

"I am the Way, the Truth and the Life". These words of Jesus are the greatest words of a great chapter, one of the greatest chapters in the greatest of all books. The rest of the chapter may indeed be regarded from one point of view as Jesus' commentary upon them, a commentary of rare beauty and wonderful depth, and this commentary gives the impression of unity and completeness in itself, an impression which remains even when one has perceived the connection of the chapter with what precedes it. It certainly embodies ideas that are to be found elsewhere in the Gospel, but this is what might be expected when we remember that in the plan of the Gospel a few leading ideas are selected and then presented and re-presented in a variety of forms. Jesus knew well, and the Evangelist had learned of Him, that it is far less important that our knowledge should be abundant than that we should grasp essentials.

Jesus as the Way in this chapter reminds us of Jesus as the Door in the Good Shepherd discourse, but in the case of the Door the image is presented to us and then left to our reflection, while in the case of the Way the matter is expounded.

"I am the Way" is an arresting declaration, but the way to what? Familiar as the chapter is, it is easy to lose oneself in enjoyment of the beauty of its individual verses and thereby to miss something of the teaching of the whole. If however we read the chapter, keeping on our guard against this danger, we shall find that it depicts to us at least four distinct goals to which Jesus is the way.

Firstly, Jesus is the way to Heaven, and Heaven, be it observed, is conceived of in the teaching of Jesus, even when exhibited in the selections of the most spiritual of the Evangelists, as something more than a spiritual state. Heaven is a prepared place for a prepared people. Certainly it is possible to enter during our earthly life into a spiritual state that gives a foretaste of the joy of Heaven, but, if we follow a good deal of modern thought and resolve Heaven into nothing more than a spiritual state, let us at least recognize that our view runs counter to the express declaration of Jesus "I go to prepare a place for you". Jesus went to prepare a place for believers, and the way to that place is Jesus Himself; it lies in an acceptance of Him as Saviour and Lord and obedience to His commandments.

Jesus is however the way to something more than a prepared place. He is the way, and the only way, to a knowledge of the Father. "If ye had known Me, ye would have known My Father also." Left to itself the human mind can form only the vaguest idea of what God is like, but nevertheless we need not remain in ignorance. Jesus has revealed Him, and so strongly and so obviously has this insistence of Jesus on Himself as the revealer of the Father impressed the Evangelist that men have seen in it the master idea of the Gospel.

Yet Jesus is not only the way to Heaven and to a knowledge of

the Father, important as these may be. He is the way to power, to a power that depends on belief on Him. "He that believeth on Me the works that I do shall he do also". Now there are two points about which we must be clear at this stage. In the first place we must distinguish between the works of Jesus and the work of Jesus. When we speak of the work of Jesus in the singular what we have principally in mind is the redemption of mankind. That work has been done once for all and is not in question here. Yet, though we must not place too wide an interpretation on the expression "works", we must be equally careful not to place upon it too narrow an interpretation. Jesus' works included something more than His miracles. The deeds of loving kindness that He performed and the gracious words that proceeded out of His mouth, these, equally with His miracles, were works of Jesus. Such are the works that shall be done by them that believe on Jesus. This particular promise of Jesus has indeed hitherto received only a partial fulfilment, but it is not wholly unfulfilled. For him who is willing to receive it the power is there, and its source is a spiritual unity that springs from belief. If one believes in Jesus, really and truly believes that He was and is what He claimed to be, then it is impossible not to pass from belief to something greater than belief—love, and love in its turn will inevitably lead to obedience. "If a man love Me, he will keep My word". This is the true test of the reality of love, but Jesus does not stop there. The promise remains—"My Father will love him, and We will come unto him and make Our abode with him". We must not forget, however, that there is an implied converse—unless we love Jesus and keep His word, God cannot make His abode with us.

Finally, Jesus is the way to peace. "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you". This peace—"My peace"—is something different from what the world understands by peace. It is "not as the world giveth". The Roman historian may say "Where they make a desert they call it peace". The victorious forces of war ravage a district, convert flourishing homesteads into heaps of ashes, leave the ploughman's body to cumber the earth while the plough rusts in the furrow, and the palling silence that follows the extinction of life man dignifies with the name of peace. Not so Jesus. The source of the peace He gives is life, not death. The untroubled calm that can survive what man calls misfortune, that can rise above the shattering of a man's or woman's dearest earthly hopes, this is the peace of God, the peace that Jesus gives. "Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid".

Though Jesus is all this—the way to Heaven, to knowledge of the Father, to power and to peace—He is much more. He is the Truth. Pilate, whether in jest or earnest, may voice the age-long query "What is truth?" but the Christian does not share his doubt. For the Christian the Jesus Who stood in bonds before Pilate enshrines the truth that Pilate sought. We must however have a clear idea of Jesus' meaning when He declares that He is the Truth, for a single word may express

more than one conception. This is well illustrated by the way in which the Revisers spoiled the beautiful passage just quoted—"Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid"—by substituting the word "fearful" for the word "afraid". In this case the Greek is correctly translated by "afraid," but "fearful," while it may mean "afraid," has also another and quite different meaning. So it is with the word "truth". Truth means conformity to fact. We call a statement true when in our opinion it correctly represents the facts. This does not however exhaust the meaning of the word. It is not quite what we mean when we speak of a "true" man. So used the word "true" means sincere or upright. It has been suggested that, when the word "truth" is used in the Fourth Gospel, it always signifies sincerity. This is a rather disconcerting suggestion, for it is not enough to know that Jesus was sincere in His claims. A sincere man may be mistaken and, if Jesus was mistaken, His sincerity will not save. Ethics seeks to evolve rules for human conduct, but before we can make up our minds what we ought to do we must determine what we want to achieve. This makes the rules of Ethics of very doubtful utility, for, if we put revelation aside, it does not seem possible to determine the object of life. If however we look at the fourteenth chapter of the Fourth Gospel, we shall find that the declaration "I am the Truth" is followed very closely by reiterated injunctions to keep Jesus' commandments. When Jesus declares that He is the Truth, He must surely mean that He is the standard of conduct. The Christian ought to do certain things, not because some process of mental reasoning recommends it, but because he loves Jesus and Jesus commanded them. "If ye love Me, ye will keep My commandments".

Now Jesus' ministry extended over no more than three short years. His commandments could not cover all possible cases. How were His disciples to act when He was no longer with them in the body and an occasion arose to which no specific commandment of His was applicable? How is the Christian of to-day to act in such a case? Jesus has an answer. "The Father will give you another Helper, even the Spirit of Truth". It is the Spirit of Truth, Whom the world cannot receive, Who will help to right decisions.

The declaration "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life" is a threefold declaration, and in exposition of the third idea "I am the Life" the fourteenth chapter of John's Gospel says very little, partly perhaps because the subject is so fully treated elsewhere in the Gospel. Yet the one comment of Jesus here preserved is such that the chapter would not be complete without it. "Because I live", says Jesus, "ye shall live also". Death need not affright the Christian. Jesus has won the victory over death, and what lies beyond the veil is a prolongation of life. Not only so, but it will be a developed, more abundant life. There are some friends to whom it is a joy to be under an obligation, and in the life beyond the Christian will assuredly rejoice in the knowledge that for the very possibility of such a life he is dependent on Jesus. Because Jesus lives, we shall live also.

CHAPTER XX.

JESUS AS THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD.

Jesus as the light of the world is another of the master ideas of the Fourth Gospel. The following passages from the Gospel—six of them reproducing sayings of Jesus and the other two extracts from the Prologue doubtless based on His teaching—illustrate the presentation of the idea—I, 4; I, 9; III, 19-21; VIII, 12; IX, 5; XI, 9-10; XII, 35; XII, 46.

The conception of the light appears somewhat differently in Matthew V, 14, where it is predicated of the disciples by Jesus in the words "Ye are the light of the world". There is however no real conflict with the Fourth Gospel, for Matthew V, 16—"Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father Which is in Heaven"—shows that the light is reflected from the Father, and the Father and Jesus are one (John X, 30). A more direct parallel appears in Luke II, 32, where the aged Simeon salutes the newly-born Jesus as "a light to lighten the Gentiles . . ." The present chapter concentrates on the exposition of John XI, 9-10—"Are there not twelve hours in the day? If a man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world. But, if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because the light is not in him".

These words of Jesus state a series of simple and obvious truths. If we take them in their literal sense, doubt can hardly arise as to their meaning. It is true that the division of each recurring period of twenty-four hours into twelve hours of day and twelve hours of night, which is what is implied, may appear somewhat arbitrary, but a fondness for clear-cut antithesis is a feature of Jesus' teaching, both as presented in the Synoptics and as presented in the Fourth Gospel. In the presentation of the former we see the sheep contrasted with the goats, the wise with the foolish and the new with the old, while in the latter it is truth which stands in contrast with falsehood, fruitfulness with unfruitfulness, life with death or—as here—light with darkness. We need not be disturbed because light does not reign for exactly twelve hours out of each twenty-four. Jesus is not delivering a scientific lecture; He is stating a physical fact in rough and general terms in order to lead the minds of His hearers to a spiritual truth, and the question for us is "What is this spiritual truth?"

It is always well when trying to understand the teaching of Jesus to have before one a mental picture of the scene, a realization of the circumstances amid which it was given. What were these circumstances in the case of the words which we are now considering? A beloved friend of Jesus had been seized with sickness, his life was in danger, and in their anguish his sisters had sent their message of appeal to Him Whom they felt to be the only one who could help. The appeal was one to respond to which required no small degree of courage, for the sick man lay at Bethany, less than a couple of miles from Jerusalem,

and, as we learn from the preceding chapter of the Gospel, Jesus' last visit to Jerusalem had been marked by attempts on His life and liberty. To return to the neighborhood just now seemed like walking into the very jaws of death. What would Jesus do? Would He go? The atmosphere was one of discouragement, the degree of which may be gauged by the disciples' comments, and at first Jesus appeared to hesitate. For two days it looked as though He might have dismissed the idea of going as unnecessary and, whether it were necessary or not to the recovery of Lazarus that Jesus should go, the disciples would obviously have given their cordial approval to a refusal. What was the life of Lazarus when weighed in the balance against that of their Master? The possible gain was not worth the risk—they were only too glad that Jesus was not going. Then on their astonished ears there fell like a bombshell the words of Jesus—"Let us go into Judaea again". Their expostulation was immediate, and to that expostulation Jesus answered in the words we are discussing. What did He mean?

One notices that the question "Are there not twelve hours in the day"? is closely followed by allusions to the safety of walking by day and the danger of walking by night, and it is a ready inference that what Jesus had in mind was that the period of safety is one of limited duration. In other words on this view what Jesus meant when He asked the question "Are there not twelve hours in the day?" was that there are ONLY twelve hours in the day. For each of us life is but a little day. The hours of that day are not in all cases of equal duration, but be they long or short we know that once gone they will never recur. There is something challenging about the slipping-away of time. Ours is a solemn responsibility. The opportunity that has passed unutilized is lost for ever. Each wasted moment diminishes the total possibilities of our life here.

This is a great truth and, if it was of this that Jesus was thinking, then He must have meant that the work before Him had to be done at once. To adapt a phrase which Jesus often used in another connection "the hour was come" and in the magnitude of His nature He intended to do the work that wanted doing at whatever cost to Himself.

Was it of this, however, that Jesus was really thinking? On closer examination doubts begin to arise. Was not Jesus Himself the light of the world? Could it ever be said truly of Him that the light was not in Him? After all the question which Jesus put was not "Are there not only twelve hours in the day?" but "Are there not twelve hours in the day?" and, taken by themselves, these words convey a suggestion of sufficiency rather than of limitation. There ARE twelve hours in the day, not there are ONLY twelve hours in the day. Whether our life be long or short it will be sufficient for the work which God has given us to do. There will be twelve hours in our day, and we need no more than twelve. Death cannot come while

God has more work for us to do here. Let us go forward fearlessly—there are twelve hours in the day.

This interpretation would seem to embody a greater truth than that contained in the other. If it was indeed the thought present in the mind of Jesus, then what He intended to convey to the disciples was that even death ought to be faced if that is what is involved in doing the will of God. In that case walking in the day is to be understood as doing the will of God, and walking in the night as refusing or neglecting to do that will. As he that walketh in the light of this world stumbleth not, so he that walketh in the spiritual light of conformity to the will of God can meet with no real mishap. What looks like disaster will be only the carrying out of God's purpose, and God knows what is best.

It is not enough however to say that the interpretation now suggested does equal justice with the former to the second and third sections of the passage we are now considering. More than that may rightly be claimed. Is it not the only interpretation that makes the third section of that passage fully comprehensible? The Jesus depicted to us in the Fourth Gospel is a Being Who has existed from the beginning and will exist to all time. To such a Being there is no such limitation of opportunity as falls to the lot of man. In no case can He stumble because the light is not in Him. On the other hand, if it is obedience to the will of God that is in question, then the comparison becomes apt. Jesus cannot stumble because the light is in Him, because there is an eternally unbroken unity of will between the Father and Him.

In all this there was something more involved than the earthly life of a single disciple, however beloved. There was a stronger call than that of Lazarus, the call of a lost humanity. "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life". It was the will of God that Jesus should go to death. The Father thought the sacrifice worth while, and the Son was ready to obey. For us Jesus was obedient even unto death—for His sake shall we too not be obedient?

CHAPTER XXI.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Howard remarks that "the paucity of references to the Holy Spirit in the Synoptic record of the teaching of Jesus has often been observed". This makes the doctrine of the Fourth Gospel on the subject of even greater importance than it would otherwise be. It is sometimes contrasted with the Pauline doctrine, as for example by Carpenter, who tells us that "the function of the Spirit to distribute gifts (I Corinthians XII, 4) passes (in the Fourth Gospel) into that of guidance into the Truth", as though forsooth the role of a Person of the Trinity cannot include the exercise of more than one attribute. We need not pursue this unprofitable line of enquiry, and in this chapter our attention will be confined to the core of Jesus' teaching on the subject of the Holy Spirit as set out in John XVI, 8-11. These vital verses read in the English Authorized Version as follows—

"And when He (the Comforter) is come, He will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment; Of sin because they believe not on Me; Of righteousness, because I go to My Father, and ye see Me no more; Of judgment because the prince of this world is judged".

The English Authorized Version gives "convince" in the margin as an alternative to "reprove" and the English Revised Version substitutes "convict" besides rendering the Greek PERI by "in respect of" instead of by "of." Archbishop Bernard points out that the translation of the Greek word PARAKLETOS by "Comforter" is due to Wyclif, who meant Confortator, i. e. Strengtheners. Bernard thinks that "Advocate" is a better translation. The Revisers suggested "Helper" as well as "Advocate" in the margin, while the Vulgate avoided the question of translation by giving Paracletus as the Latin rendering. One Christian of the second century A. D., the Phrygian Montanus, distinguished between the Paraclete and the Holy Spirit. Reading John XVI in the light of the experience of his own time, he thought that it referred to a human reformer whom Jesus would send to correct abuses in the Church. He may at first have looked around for the man and have found no one inspired by such flaming zeal in the cause as himself. Doubtless he felt that God was calling him to lead the way to better things, and he claimed to be the Paraclete. Ultimately he may have become a conscious impostor, but men were wrong when they said that he had claimed to be the Holy Spirit. He drew a clear distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete, and it was the Paraclete he claimed to be (see Rainy, *Ancient Catholic Church*, pages 128, seq.).

The whole of the passage that we are considering is difficult, but if, in reading our Bibles, we pass rapidly over every passage that pre-

sents difficulty, we shall miss real treasures of unsuspected worth. We must not however treat our task of interpretation as nothing more than the solution of an intellectual problem. When we have given our best thought to the questions before us, it will still remain for the Holy Spirit to lead us into the truth.

At the outset we should notice that "the promise of the Father which ye heard from Me" mentioned by Jesus after His Resurrection and recorded in the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles is in all probability an allusion to the discourse on the Holy Spirit recorded in John XVI. At any rate there is no other part of the Gospels which the description appears to fit so well.

Some wonderful work has been done by the translators of the Bible, work so fine as to make manifest that much of it was done as directly under divine inspiration as the original composition. Yet it must be confessed that the rendering of John XVI, 8-11 in the English Authorized and Revised Versions is not very helpful in enabling us to grasp the meaning of the passage. According to the Authorized Version the Holy Spirit will reprove the world of (i. e. presumably "for") sin, righteousness and judgment, but, while it is natural to associate the idea of reproof with sin, it is foreign to righteousness and unintelligible in relation to judgment. Moreover, the Greek word here translated "reprove" is used elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel with the meaning "convict" or "convince". The Revisers chose the former of these alternatives, but their choice was not happy. It is open to the same objection as "reprove" in that it fits in with sin, but not with righteousness or judgment. Of course in criticizing the Authorized Version we have always to bear in mind that a word had not necessarily the same significance in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as it has to-day, but the Revisers ought to have done better, especially as in the margin of the Authorized Version they already found the alternative "convince" suggested. If we substitute "convince" for "convict", then at once light begins to pour in. "To convince of sin" and "to convince of righteousness" are two perfectly intelligible expressions, and so, we shall see, is "to convince of judgment" when we come to consider the meaning to be applied here to "judgment".

Who is it that is to be convinced? "The world" says the passage before us. Now in the Gospel this expression "the world" has often a special meaning. It denotes not the physical universe but a body of forces that play on us in our earthly life and tempt us to compromise in the things that matter. It is very much in this sense that Jesus here speaks of "the prince of this world;" but, besides the physical universe, its primary meaning, and this body of forces representing a very special meaning, the phrase bears yet a third meaning. We see it used with this third meaning in our Gospel when the Evangelist records the words "Lo, the world is gone after Him" (John XII, 19). Used in this third sense the phrase "the

world" means "men" or "mankind". It is this third sense which best suits the phrase when first used in the passage we are considering.

So far then we have explained the words "And He, when He is come, will convince the world" as meaning "And the Holy Spirit, when He is come, will convince mankind". Of what will He convince them? "In respect of sin" say the Revisers, but here again they are not happy. "In respect of" sounds like some official jargon, like a phrase in a letter from a Government Department, and Jesus, we may be sure, did not speak like that. It is important to retain the spirit of Jesus' utterances as well as the letter, and the compilers of the Authorized Version did well to prefer the simple "of" to a more cumbrous phrase.

We may now go a step further and say "convince mankind of sin", for that is one of the things the Holy Spirit does. The possession of the Holy Spirit as a permanent indwelling power is doubtless confined to believers, but the Holy Spirit has other work to do besides comforting, sustaining, helping and guiding THEM. He is at work in the world moving the minds of men to a consciousness of sin. That is the first step. Jesus came not to call the righteous but sinners (Mark II, 17 and elsewhere). Man is never farther from God than when he is most satisfied with himself, and conversely he who can sing the much-criticized words "Vile and full of sin am I" and mean them is very near to the Kingdom. When it denies this basic truth Modernism may think itself very wise, but God has confounded the wisdom of the wise of this world. It can never be wiser than Jesus.

Why is sin attributed to men? "Because", says Jesus, "they believe not on Me". This idea is developed in John XV, 22, where Jesus declares "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin". Jesus declared to men what was right and what was wrong, and after that they had no shadow of an excuse for choosing what was wrong.

Now this declaration that the Holy Spirit will convince men of sin holds good both of the period before, and the period after, conversion. In the former period such a conviction is a necessary preliminary to conversion, but experience shows that sin does not cease with conversion. The converted man or woman remains profoundly conscious of it. It may be suggested that this is because the Christian does not believe on Jesus as he ought. If his belief in Him were stronger, if love for Him filled his heart, that belief and the love that is its fruit would surely become a compelling force that with God's help would win its way to that complete victory over sin for which the Christian prays, for which he hopes, but which he never seems to realize.

While the Holy Spirit gives men the consciousness of sin, He gives something more. He convinces also of righteousness. When we say that we mean that He convinces us that, in spite of our sin, we

are declared right with God. The dominant note of the Christian ought to be the note of confidence. He does not hope that he is justified—he knows, and he knows because the Holy Spirit declares it. Through Jesus his sins, though they were as scarlet, are washed away. As Jesus Himself puts it, the Holy Spirit can convince of righteousness because He—Jesus—has gone to the Father. Had He remained on earth the work of atonement for sin would still be incomplete. There are those who tell us that the earthly life of Jesus, that life with its unsullied sinlessness, that life of which the claim could truly be made, as it could of no other, "Which of you convicteth Me of sin?" (John VIII, 46), was itself an atonement for sin. No doubt the life, as well as the death, had a redemptive value, but, whatever the redemptive value of the life, it needed the death on the Cross to complete the work and make it fully effectual. Jesus had to go to the Father, and He had to go by the way of the Cross. It is idle to conjecture what might have happened if He had continued on earth and gone on living the perfect life and giving the world His great moral teaching. That life could have been lived, that teaching—which He had heard from the Father (John III, 32)—given, only so long as the relationship between Father and Son remained unbroken, and that relationship involved obedience, and willing obedience, to the will of the Father, which in the case of Jesus meant the way of the Cross.

The Holy Spirit then convinces men of sin and righteousness, but He convinces of something more, and that something more the English versions call "judgment". The word is not, however, calculated to bring out the full meaning. The judgment that is pronounced in the case of the prince of this world is condemnation, decisive and final. He has been condemned by that same death on the Cross which justifies the believer on Jesus. Who is the prince of this world? Surely he is the representative of the forces of evil, the Devil. The forces of evil in the world are visualized as having done their worst. We see that worst in love hanging on a cross of wood. Yet it is on them and not upon the sufferer upon the Cross that the real condemnation is seen to have been pronounced.

It is not enough to be convinced of sin. It is possible to recognize sin and not to trouble about it, perhaps to glory in it. Jesus calls upon us to grasp not only the fact of sin, but the gravity, the heinousness of sin. Sin stands condemned of God. The prince of this world has been condemned, and the condemnation is sufficient to stamp sin as what it really is, something from which to shrink with loathing. Sin is not merely the absence of goodness, as darkness is the absence of light; it is a positive, not a negative, conception, a stern reality, not a figment of the theologians.

Now we see at last the complete picture, which the phraseology of the English translations had perhaps before obscured from us. We see man conscious of his sin, conscious of the condemnation that

sin involves, and yet conscious of his own justification. The believer in Jesus is declared righteous through imputation of the righteousness of the great substitute. The Cross is the central point of the Christian Gospel. Without the Cross that Gospel loses its compelling power and Christianity is degraded from the rank of the one religion that matters to that of a moral code, dignified indeed but bereft of its highest purpose. Such a code will not suffice. We must look beyond it to that Cross which towers over the wrecks of time—towers and will tower to the end.

APPENDIX I.

"JUDGMENT" IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

God's purpose—which the Son is carrying out—is salvation, not condemnation (John III, 17, XII, 47). The unbeliever condemns himself (John III, 18). His failure to accept the Son and His teaching is evidence provided by himself that he prefers darkness to light (John III, 19, XII, 48). The coming of the Son sets up new standards by which vision and blindness are to be tested (John VIII, 15-16, IX, 39) and by their acceptance or rejection of those standards men are judged (John XII, 48). Thus from one point of view the Son judges (John VIII, 26) and from another He does not judge (John VIII, 15, XII, 47). It is because of His unity with the Father that the Son is able to set up His new standards (John V, 30, VIII, 16, 26). Obedient to the Father (John V, 30, VIII, 26) the Son wields authority in relation to men (John V, 27).

APPENDIX II.

NOTE ON THE "WE" OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The following suggestions are put forward as to the meaning to be attached to the pronoun "We" in the passages quoted—

John I, 14—"And we beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten of the Father"; and

John I, 16—"Of His fulness we all received and grace for grace".

In these two cases "We" equals The Evangelist and his fellow-disciples who had first-hand knowledge of Jesus' earthly career.

John III, 11—"We speak what We do know and bear witness of what We have seen and ye receive not Our witness".

Here "We" equals The Father and the Son.

John IX, 4-5—"We" (i. e. God the Father and Jesus) "must work the works of Him" (i. e. God the Father) "that sent Me" (i. e. Jesus) "while it is day" (i. e. while I am on the earth); "the night cometh when no man can work" (for Jesus this means that with His departure His opportunity as man for revealing God the Father to men will have gone. Hence His reason for breaking the Sabbath—John IX, 14). "When" (n. b. not "while") "I am in the world, I am the light of the world" (Transition of ideas—when, i. e. if, Jesus is in our world, He is our light).

John XXI, 24—"We know that his witness is true".

"We" equals a group of disciples attesting that the Evangelist was a man who would not lie.

APPENDIX III.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The following, among other books, have been utilized in the preparation of the present volume:

Holy Bible—

Greek and Latin Texts in Nestle's New Testament.

Authorized and Revised English Versions.

Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures.

Swete's Old Testament in Greek, 2nd edition (1914).

Archbishop Temple—Readings in St. John's Gospel (1939).

Archbishop Bernard—St. John in International Critical Commentary (1929).

Lagrange—St. John (1927).

Bousset—Kyrios Christos (1913).

Stanton—The Gospels as Historical Documents, Part III (1920).

Grill—Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des Vierten Evangeliums, Vol. I (1902), Vol. II (1923).

Scott—The Fourth Gospel (1906).

Wendt—Gospel according to St. John (1900).

Reville—Le quatrieme Evangile (1901).

Grandmaison—Jesus Christ, Sa Personne, Son Message, Ses Preuves, 10e edition (1929).

Jackson—The Fourth Gospel and some recent German Criticism (1906).

Wendt—The Johannine Letters and Johannine Christianity (1925).

Abbot—Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, External Evidence (1880).

Calmes—L'Evangile selon Saint Jean (1904; 4th edition 1923).

Lord Charnwood—According to St. John (1925).

Muirhead—Message of the Fourth Gospel (1925).

Macgregor—Gospel of John (1928).

Jackson—Problem of the Fourth Gospel (1918).

Drummond—Inquiry (1903).

Bishop Westcott—Gospel according to St. John (1886).

Scott Holland—The Fourth Gospel (1923).

Pope—Catholic Student's Aids to the Bible, Vol. 4 (1926).

Sanday—Criticism of the Fourth Gospel (1905).

Puech—Histoire de la Litterature grecque chretienne, Tome I (1928).

McNabb—From a Friar's Cell (1923).

Strachan—The Fourth Gospel, its significance and environment, 1st edition (1920); 3rd edition, modifying the conclusions announced in the 1st edition (1941).

Burney—Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel (1922).

Gardner—The Ephesian Gospel (1915).

Chapman—John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel (1911).
 Goguel—Jean-Baptiste (1928).
 Fouard—St. John and the Close of the Apostolic Age (1905).
 Garvie—The Beloved Disciple (1922).
 Carpenter—The Johannine Writings (1927).
 Dodd—Background of the Fourth Gospel (1935).
 Wright—Meaning and Message of the Fourth Gospel (1933).
 Eisler—Enigma of the Fourth Gospel (1937).
 Nolloth—The Fourth Evangelist (1925).
 Howard—The Fourth Gospel in recent criticism (1931).
 Sanders—The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church (1943).
 Gardner-Smith—St. John and the Synoptic Gospels (1938).
 Burch—Structure and Message of St. John's Gospel (1928).
 Forbes—The Johannine Literature (1907).
 Warburton Lewis—Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel (1910).
 McClymont—St. John in Century Bible, 2nd edition (1922).
 Schmiedel—The Johannine Writings (1908).
 Streeter—The Four Gospels (1924).
 Delafosse—Le quatrieme Evangile (1925).
 Smith—The Fourth Gospel: its Historical Importance (1926).
 Odeberg—The Fourth Gospel.
 Hoskyns—The Fourth Gospel.
 Howard—Christianity According to St. John (1943).
 Bacon—Making of the New Testament.
 Bacon—The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate (1910).
 Dodd—The Bible To-day (1946).
 Hoare—Original Order and Chapters of St. John's Gospel (1944).
 Bishop Gore—The Holy Spirit and the Church (1904).
 Rainy—The Ancient Catholic Church (1902).
 Swete—The Holy Spirit in the New Testament (1921).
 Moffatt—Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.

BS
3615
.H76

Holloway
The twilight of the
critics

3-31-53

18050

APR 1

1953

Salom

JUN 1

1953

Stoff

JAN 4

1958

Katherine Lathrop

MAR 31

1958

faculty per. J.E.L.

NOV 26

1958

Ervin Long

DEC 10

1958

CTS

DEC 10

1958

RENEWED

DEC 17

1958

BS
3615
.H76

18050

Holloway

The twilight of the
critics

APR 1

1958

Salon JUN 1 1953

JAN 4

1958

Fatherhood of the

NOV 26

1958

DEC 10 1958

DEC 10 1958

RENEWED

DEC 17 1958

BS3615

18050

.H76

SWIFT HALL LIBRARY